

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM
WILLIAM KURRELMMEYER
JOSE ROBLES

RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE
HAZELTON SPENCER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
TILLEY, M. P.—"The Maid's Metamorphosis and Ovid's "Metamorphoses,"	139
BUSH, D.—The Tedious Brief Scene of Pyramus and Thisbe, - - -	144
GRAY, H. D.—Chronology of Shakespeare's Plays, - - -	147
JOHNSTON, G. B.—Notes on Jonson's 'Execration upon Vulcan,' - -	150
RICE, W. G.—"To Turn Turk," - - -	153
POUND, LOUISE—The Etymology of 'Stir' 'Prison' Again, - - -	154
CHINARD, G.—Vigny et l'Amiral Collingwood, - - -	155
GREEN, O. H.—The Date of 'Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña,' -	163
NYKL, A. R.—Old Spanish Terms of Small Value, - - -	166
STOUDEMIRE, S. A.—D. Antonio Gil y Zárate's Birth-Date, - - -	171
SMITH, WINIFRED.—Maistre André, Italien, - - -	172
KURRELMMEYER, W.—Goethe'sche Verse in einer Wieland'schen Dichtung?	173

REVIEWS:—

E. FARAL, <i>La Légende arthurienne</i> . [R. S. Loomis.] - - -	175
RÉPONSE. [Edmond Faral.] - - -	179
REBUTTAL. [R. S. Loomis.] - - -	181
A. GRISCOM and R. E. JONES, <i>The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth</i> . [A. C. L. Brown.] - - -	182
J. KÖRNER, <i>Briefe von und an A. W. Schlegel</i> ; H. LÜDEKE, <i>Ludwig Tieck und die Brüder Schlegel</i> . [E. H. Zeydel.] - - -	184
W. HOFSTAETTER and U. PETERS, <i>Sachwörterbuch der Deutschkunde</i> . [E. Feise.]	187
W. FLEMING, <i>Deutsche Literatur. Reihel Barock: Barockdrama. Band 1. Das schesische Kunstdrama</i> . [M. B. Evans.] - - -	187
R. W. ZANDTVOORT, <i>Sidney's Arcadia. A Comparison Between the Two Versions</i> . [A. Feuillerat.] - - -	189
E. I. FRIPP, <i>Shakespeare's Haunts near Stratford</i> . [E. E. Willoughby.] - -	191
S. A. TANNENBAUM, <i>Shakespeare and "Sir Thomas Moore"</i> . [R. S. Forsythe.]	192
R. C. BALD, <i>A Game at Chess by Thomas Middleton</i> . [B. M. Wagner.] - -	195
M. W. LATHAM, <i>The Elizabethan Fairies</i> . [E. J. Simmons.] - - -	197
J. D. WILSON and MAY YARDLEY, <i>Lewes Lavater: Of Ghosts and Sprites Walking by Nyght, 1572</i> . [O. J. Campbell.] - - -	198
A. HARBAGE, <i>Thomas Killigrew: Cavalier Dramatist</i> . [H. Spencer.] - - -	200
D. M. WALMSLEY, <i>Epsom Wells and The Volunteers or The Stock-Jobbers by Thomas Shadwell</i> . [A. S. Borgman.] - - -	201
BONAMY DOBRÉE, <i>Restoration Tragedy, 1660-1720</i> . [W. S. Clark.] - - -	202
H. J. C. GRIERSON, <i>Cross Currents in English Literature of the XVIIth Century</i> . [Marjorie Nicolson.] - - -	205

BRIEF MENTION

of E. SEATON and M. S. SERJEANTSON, <i>Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature</i> ; I. GARWOOD, <i>Heath Manual of the Literature of England</i> ; H. CAPLAN, <i>G. P. della Mirandola on the Imagination</i> ; S. HOWE, <i>Wilhelm Meister and his English Kinsmen</i> ; R. V. A. CAULFEILD, <i>The French Literature of Louisiana</i> ; T. H. DICKINSON, <i>Chief Contemporary Dramatists</i> ; D. D. ARUNDELL, <i>Dryden and Howard</i> ; W. CONNELLY, <i>Brawny Wycherley</i> - - -	207
---	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,

Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Robles

ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, E. Greenlaw,
R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. **Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope.** In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, *not* vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the *editors* with an indication of the *total* number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

UNIVERSITÉ DE FRANCE

Académie d'Aix-en-Provence

COLLÈGE DE CANNES

COURS DE VACANCES : JULY AND AUGUST

Ideal for Study and Recreation

Courses are offered for teachers and students of French in conversation, literature, civilization, philology, phonetics, methods, syntax, composition (elementary, intermediate, advanced), corrective work in pronunciation. Conversational groups limited to five members. Courses leading to M. A. and Ph. D. degrees.

The Collège de Cannes is located in a beautiful park overlooking the Mediterranean. Ideal for sports: tennis, swimming, motoring, golfing, fishing, mountain climbing. Week-end motor excursions to places of interest.

Cost including steamer, railroads, board, lodging and week-end excursions

\$350 up

For detailed information write to

Mlle Hélène Harvitt, Ph. D., Dean, 4 East 52nd Street, New York City
or Brooklyn College, 66 Court Street, Brooklyn, New York

tors
the
ript
cles
the
of
quo-
not
MP.,
an
com-

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLVI

MARCH, 1931

Number 3

"THE MAID'S METAMORPHOSIS" AND OVID'S "METAMORPHOSES"

I

Important incidents in the Ceyx-Alcyone and Apollo-Daphne stories in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are the source of Act II, Scene i, and of Act III, Scene i, in *The Maid's Metamorphosis*. This indebtedness, although obscured by changes in the material borrowed, may be clearly traced in incidents, characters, and speeches in these two scenes.¹

In the earlier scene in *The Maid's Metamorphosis* (II, i), Juno dispatches Iris to the cave of Somnus to bid the latter send a spirit disguised as the lost Eurymine to comfort Ascanio in a dream. Somnus in fulfillment of Juno's command dispatches his son, Morpheus, in the form of Eurymine, to tell the sleeping Ascanio that he is to seek "an aged Hermit," who will "bring us both together at the last."

This scene is founded on incidents in the Ceyx-Alcyone story (lines 583-709), in Book XI, of the *Metamorphoses*, in which Juno dispatches Iris "to the sluggish house of Slomber," to bid him send "a Dreame in shape of Ceyx too his wyfe Alcyone, for too shew her playne the losing of his lyfe." In the play, as in the *Metamorphoses*, the willing messenger of Juno, Iris, penetrates to

¹ In his examination of the evidence for the authorship of *The Maid's Metamorphosis*, R. W. Bond, in *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, 1902, III, 336, includes in his list of details that are "suggestive of Lyly," the "use made of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in regard to Somnus and his three sons (II, i) and Apollo and Hyacinth (III, i)." The incidents noted by Bond as from Ovid embrace lines 175-179 in II, i; and lines 51-70 in III, i. Bond knows of no other influence of Ovid in the play.

the inaccessible cave of Somnus, arouses the drowsy god, and has the command of Juno accomplished by Morpheus, the son of Somnus, who appears in the shape of the lost loved-one to the sleeping Alcyone (Ascanio). A notable divergence from the Ovidian story marks the end of the incident in *The Maid's Metamorphosis*. Whereas Alcyone abandons herself to despair upon learning from the ghost of her husband that he has been drowned, Ascanio is encouraged by the vision of Eurymine to seek the "aged Hermit" who "will bring us both together at the last."

In addition to these parallels of characters and of incidents in *The Maid's Metamorphosis*, there is an agreement of detail with Ovid's poem that leaves no doubt that the author of the play is borrowing directly from Ovid, and not from Spenser's description of the house of Morpheus (*Faerie Queene*, I, i, 38-44), as some have held.

In the other scene of *The Maid's Metamorphosis* based upon Ovid's poem (III, i), we have the metamorphosis of Eurymine, which gives the play its name. It is derived with changes from Ovid's story of Apollo's love for Daphne and of her later transformation into a laurel (*Metamorphoses*, I, 452-567). In it Apollo woos Eurymine in the same proud language as, in Ovid, he woos Daphne. As in the *Metamorphoses*, he boasts of his Olympian ancestry, of the honor done him in Delphos, and of his skill in music and in the healing art. Further, Eurymine, like Daphne, is freed in the end from the unwelcome attentions of Apollo by a transformation. At this point, however, as in the earlier scene in *The Maid's Metamorphosis*, the story differs radically from the original. In each instance, the end of the story

² In a footnote to his discussion of *The Maid's Metamorphosis* in his *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*, 1906, W. W. Greg dissents from the generally held opinion that the description of the cave of Morpheus in *The Maid's Metamorphosis* (II, i, 112) depends upon a study of the house of Morpheus in *The Faerie Queene*. In Greg's opinion the author of *The Maid's Metamorphosis* "certainly drew his own account straight from Ovid (*Metam.*, 592, etc.)." This may be seen by reference to the account of the sons of Somnus that appears in the *Metamorphoses* and in the play, but not in Spenser. Not only is the description of the cave of Morpheus drawn straight from Ovid, as Greg states, but the entire scene from line 64 to the end is based on the Alcyone-Ceyx story.

has been made much less painful.³ In Ovid, Daphne's prayer for help is heard by her father, Peneus, who changes her into a laurel. In the play, Eurymine escapes Apollo's love by persuading him to prove his boasted power by turning her into a man.

II

The author of *The Maid's Metamorphosis* clearly uses Golding's translation of the *Metamorphoses* as the source of his Ovid borrowings. A comparison of the italicised words in the following passages from the play and from Golding's *Ovid*, in which Apollo addresses Eurymine (Daphne), reveals how closely, at times, the author of the play copied Golding's words, phrases and rhymes:

*Maid's Metamorphosis.*⁴

Oh stay sweet Nymph, with more
aduisement view,

What one he is, that for thy grace
doth sue:

I am not one that haunts on hills
or Rocks,

I am no shepheard wayting on my
flocks.

I am no boystrous Satyre, no nor
Faune,

That am with pleasure of thy
beautie drawne.

Thou dost not know God wot, thou
dost not kno,

The wight, whose presence thou dis-
dainest so.

Eurymine. But I may know, if you
wold please to tell.

Golding's *Ovid*.⁵

Stay Nymph: . . . Yet would I
wishe thee take advise, and wisely
for to viewe

What one he is that for thy grace
in humble wise doth sewe.

I am not one that dwelles among
the hilles and stonie rockes,

I am no sheepe hearde with a Curre,
attending on the flockes:

I am no Carle nor countrie Clowne,
nor neathearde taking charge

Of cattle grazing here and there
within this Forrest large.

Thou dost not know poore simple
soule,

God wote thou dost not knowe,
From whome thou fleest. For if
thou knew, thou wouldste not flee
me so.

In Delphis is my chiefe abode, my
Temples also stande

³ Should other instances turn up in plays of known authorship, in which the ends of borrowed Ovidian stories are similarly humanized, it should assist in the identification of the author of *The Maid's Metamorphosis*.

⁴ *The Maid's Metamorphosis* (III, i, 156-171), in Lyly's *Works*, ed. Bond, III, 365.

⁵ *Shakespeare's Ovid Being Arthur Golding's Translation of the Metamorphoses*, ed. W. H. D. Rouse, London, 1904, p. 33 (I, 619-636).

<i>Apollo. My father</i> in the highest heavens doth dwell:	At Glaros and at Patara within the Lycian lande.
And I <i>am knowne</i> the sonne of Ioue to bee,	And in the Ile of Tenedos the people <i>honour mee,</i>
Whereon the folke of Delphos <i>honor</i> <i>mee.</i>	The king of Gods himself <i>is knowne</i> <i>my father</i> for to bee.
<i>By me is knowne what is, what was,</i> <i>and what shall bee,</i>	<i>By mee is knowne that was, that is,</i> <i>and that shall ensue,</i>
<i>By me are learnde</i> the Rules of harmonie.	<i>By mee men learne</i> to sundrie tunes to frame sweete ditties true,
By me the depth of <i>Phisicks</i> lore is found:	In shooting I have stedfast hand, but surer hand had hee
And <i>power of hearbes</i> that grow upon the ground.	That made this wound within my heart that heretofore was free. <i>Of Phisicke</i> and of surgerie I found the Arts for neede The <i>powre of everie herbe</i> and plant doth of my gift proceede. ^a

At other times, the author does not repeat Golding's words or rhymes, but gives a free translation of the original. As an example, Ascanio addresses the fleeting vision of Eurymine (II, i) with words that are a free rendering of Ovid's four lines beginning the speech of Apollo's (III, i), from which I have quoted above. These opening lines of Apollo's speech imploring Daphne to stay,

nympha, precor, Penei, mane! non insequor hostis;
nympha, mane! sic agna lupum, sic cerva leonem,
sic aquilam penna fugiunt trepidante columbae,
hostes quaeque suos: amor est mihi causa sequendi!
me miserum! ne prona cadas indignave laedi
crura notent sentes et sim tibi causa doloris!
aspera, qua properas, loca sunt: moderatius, oro,
curre fugamque inhibe, moderatius insequar ipse.
cui placeas, inquire tamen: non incola montis,
non ego sum pastor, non hic armenta gregesque
horridus observo. nescis, temeraria, nescis,
quem fugias, ideoque fugis: mihi Delphica tellus
et Claros et Tenedos Patareaque regia servit;
Iuppiter est genitor; per me, quod eritque fuitque
estque, patet; per me concordant carmina nervis.
certa quidem nostra est, nostra tamen una sagitta
certior, in vacuo quae vulnera pectore fecit!
inventum medicina meum est, opiferque per orbem
dicor, et herbarum subiecta potentia nobis.

Met., I, 504-522.

could not be appropriately addressed by Apollo to the stationary Eurymine, but were fittingly addressed by Ascanio to the vanishing form of Eurymine:

Maid's Metamorphosis.

Eurymine: Oh wilt thou not attend?
 Flie from thy foe: Ascanio is thy
 friend.
 The fearfull Hare, so shuns the
 labouring hound,
 And so the Dear eschues the Hunts-
 man wound
 The trembling Foule, so flies the
 Falcons gripe:
 The Bond-man, so, his angry mais-
 ters stripe.
 I follow not, as *Phoebus Daphne did*:
 Nor as the Dog pursues the trembl-
 ing Kid.

*Golding's Ovid.*⁷

I pray thee Nymph Penaeis stay,
 I chase not as a fo:
 Stay Nymph: the Lambes so flee ye
 Wolves, the Stags ye Lions so:
 With flittring fethers sielle
 Doves so from the Gossehauke flie,
 And every creature from his foe.
 Love is the cause that I
 Do followe thee.⁸

If, as Bond says, the use of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in *The Maid's Metamorphosis* is "suggestive of Lyly," the evidence presented above, of a much wider use of the *Metamorphoses* in the play than has been noted, makes for a somewhat greater probability of Lyly's authorship. On the other hand, if it can be shown that Lyly does not use Golding's translation in other borrowings from the *Metamorphoses*—and Bond has no mention of such use—the fact that Golding's *Ovid* is clearly used in *The Maid's Metamorphosis* points to the probable composition of the play by another hand than Lyly's.

M. P. TILLEY

University of Michigan

⁷ nympha, precor, Penei, mane! non insequor hostis;
 Nympha, mane! sic agna lupun, sic cerva leonem,
 sic aquilam penna fugiunt trepidante columbae,
 hostes quaque suos: amor est mihi causa sequendi!

Met., I, 504-508.

⁸ The popularity of these lines of Ovid is attested by their earlier appearance in prose form, in Brian Melbancke's *Philotimus* (Pr), 1583, among the borrowings in that book from Golding's *Ovid*: "Stay nymph, and flye me not. The lambes so flye the wolues, ye Staggs the Lyons so, the doues so from the gosshauke flye, and euery creature from his foe."

THE TEDIOUS BRIEF SCENE OF PYRAMUS AND
THISBE

In an article in *Studies in Philology* Miss M. L. Farrand has argued that Shakespeare's burlesque play in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was directly indebted to the story of Pyramus and Thisbe in Moffett's *The Silkwormes and their Flies* (1599).¹ The date of publication is one obvious difficulty, which Miss Farrand recognizes, but she thinks Shakespeare probably saw the piece in manuscript. Doubtless Moffett did write the poem some years before it appeared, perhaps, as Miss Farrand suggests, at the same time as his prose work on insects and silkworms, that is, about 1590-95; it is not likely that it was done twenty years before. Miss Farrand also remarks that, while so far as dates of publication go, "it is conceivable that Moffett was influenced by Shakespeare," yet it is out of the question "that a classical scholar retelling with serious purpose Ovid's story should turn for assistance, or even suggestion, to a burlesque version by a popular dramatist." But a more important question Miss Farrand does not ask. Would a popular dramatist incorporate in a play a burlesque of a poem which he and a few others knew in manuscript? When Shakespeare wrote burlesques he handled things well known to most of his public, such as Euphuism, "King Cambises' vein," Marlowe's soaring rhetoric. A burlesque of Moffett would hardly be seconded by the forward child understanding. Shakespeare's tragical mirth is a burlesque of old-fashioned drama, and the point would be as clear to his audience as a travesty of melodrama would be to us now.

Such an intention does not preclude the possibility that Shakespeare might still use Moffett's piece for material, but it is not probable, and Miss Farrand's parallels are not convincing. Some years ago I made a rather careful comparison of Moffett and Shakespeare and the results seemed negative, as they still do, in spite of Miss Farrand's interesting study. In the first place, it is possible to find as many parallels, and as good ones, between Shakespeara

¹ "An Additional Source for *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*," *SP*, xxvii (1930), 233 ff. Miss Farrand very conveniently assembles most of the Shakespearean lines and quotes extensively from Moffett's little-known piece.

and the long poem on Pyramus and Thisbe in the *Gorgeous Gallery* (1578) as Miss Farrand offers between Shakespeare and Moffett. A number of these last do not show much more than that the two authors were treating the same subject and writing Elizabethan English, and I shall not go through the list in detail.

One of the most obvious stylistic tricks in Shakespeare is the excessive alliteration, a trick vastly beloved by versifiers of the previous generation, and conspicuous throughout the *Gorgeous Gallery* as well as in *The History of Pyramus and Thisbe*.² Moffett is not especially alliterative.

A number of Miss Farrand's parallels are single words, such as *bliss*, *cheer*, *quell*, *fell*, *breast*, *spite*, which are not strong evidence for a relationship between two Elizabethan pieces on the same theme. For instance, the use of *blade* for sword, which is one of the links between Shakespeare and Moffett, occurs more than once in the *History*. It occurs also in the *Sonet* in *A Handful of Pleasant Delights* and in Gale's *Pyramus and Thisbe* (1596), poems which Miss Farrand mentions to dismiss.³ Miss Farrand quoted this line from Moffett, "Rouse up thy sprights: those heavie lookes cheere," to put beside it Shakespeare's "That liv'd, that lov'd, that lik'd, that look'd with cheer." But the *History* (p. 115) has this line,

To her with thee that liu'd and lou'd, and eke with thee will dye.

The line is closer to Shakespeare's, and, besides, has the word *eke*, which is another of the bonds between Shakespeare and Moffett.

Miss Farrand quotes Moffett's "embru'd with blood" for Shakespeare's "my breast imbrue"; the *History* has "embrude with blood" (p. 112) and so does a ballad to be mentioned later. The Thisbe of the *History* stabs herself "beneath her pap," and Shakespeare's Pyramus twice mentions that region. It would be tedious and far from brief to catalogue more details; I have recorded so many only to show that the *History* is quite as good a candidate as

² Ed. Rollins, pp. 103 ff.

³ *Handful*, ed. Rollins, pp. 35 ff. Gale's poem is much indebted to *Hero and Leander* and offers nothing for us here—unless "Her tender nonage did of true loue sauour" be deemed a relative of "Thisbe, the flowers have odious savours sweet," and something may be left to the jerks of invention. The actual date of publication of Gale's poem is uncertain.

Moffett's piece. It does not follow that Shakespeare had either in mind.

In relation to Shakespeare's "bloody mouth" Miss Farrand quotes Moffett's "bloody teeth." "Bloody" of course is inevitable in such a tale. It may be noticed that Chaucer's version, which one may assume Shakespeare knew, has Shakespeare's phrase twice (ll. 807, 820). Shakespeare's "Speak! speak!" is also derived from Moffett's "Speak, love, O speak. . . ." Chaucer has "O spek, my Piramus!" (l. 880). Shakespeare's exquisite line about the wall, by the way, "Thy stones with lime and hair knit up in thee," might have started from Chaucer's "Our wordes through thy lyme and eek thy stoon" (765).

Among Miss Farrand's "most significant" parallels is Moffett's allusion to "the sisters three." We find the phrase in the song of Pithias in Edwards's play which editors have quoted as an illustration of the dramatic fashion that Shakespeare was making fun of:

Gripe me, you greedy grief,
And present pangs of death!
You sisters three with cruel hands,
With speed now stop my breath! ⁴

This alliterative outburst is at least as near to Eracles' vein as anything in Moffett; moreover, in the preceding stanza Pithias calls, like Pyramus, on the Furies.

Finally might be mentioned the ballad on "The lamentable historie of Sephalus with the Unfortunat end of Procris," of c. 1568.⁵ It will be remembered that among the antiphonal protestations of Shakespeare's lovers are the lines

Not Shafalus to Procrus was so true.
As Shafalus to Procrus, I to you.

The long ballad discards the Ovidian story, except the catastrophe, and for the earlier part transfers to Cephalus and Procris the experiences of Pyramus and Thisbe. In style the tragic climax is quite akin to Shakespeare's:

Oh greeff of greefs most dolorous,
Oh hap of Happs most pyteous,

⁴ Adams, *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas*, p. 584. Cf. the allusion to Atropos in the *Sonet*.

⁵ Howell's *Poems*, ed. Grosart, pp. 146 ff.

Deare Ladies steppe your foote to myne,
To mourne with me your hartes inclyne.

Whan Sephalus his Procris founde,
Imbrude with blood on euery side,
The arowe stickinge in the wounde,
That bleeding sore did gape full wyde,
He curst the gods that skies possesst
The systers three and all the rest.

And fayntly spake, no Ladie no,
You shall not vanishe hence a lone,
My ghoste alas your frendly foo,
Shall wayte your precyous soule upon,
And with that worde to ende his lyfe,
He slue him selfe with bloody knyfe.

The death of Pyramus in the *Handful* ballad is in similar vein. In both, incidentally, Pyramus is called a "knight," as he is in Shakespeare (v, i, 284).

One must conclude that Shakespeare's play, being a burlesque of a popular bygone fashion in drama, was not built on any one model; and that, even if he could have known Moffett's poem, which is doubtful, it contained virtually nothing in substance or phrase which might not have been taken from more familiar and popular pieces, both narrative and dramatic.

DOUGLAS BUSH

University of Minnesota

CHRONOLOGY OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

The natural and well justified suspicion that metrical peculiarities may be made to prove all manner of things which are not so may perhaps be somewhat allayed if those who employ the metrical tests will make use of a very simple experiment. Ever since the days of the New Shakespeare Society critics have realized that Shakespeare tended to employ more and more the characteristics which make for ease and flexibility of meter; and that he did so instinctively and not deliberately is what gives significance to the tables of percentages which have been compiled. On this account the introduction of prose or rhyme is of less consequence than the percentages of double endings, of run-on lines, and of speeches end-

ing within the line. The arrangement of the plays according to any one of these three tests would of course give us an impossible chronology; for the nature of the subject matter, the mood of the moment, or some unguessed circumstance would surely prevent a perfectly regular development along any specific line. But where we have three separate tendencies, each away from the verse of Shakespeare's early contemporaries and toward that of his last period, it is clear that an average of the three will bring us closer to the true sequence than any one test when taken alone.

But the amazing result of merely striking an average of the percentages of double endings, run-on lines, and speeches ending with the line, as given in the tables of Neilson and Thorndike's *The Facts About Shakespeare*, makes it imperative that the cogency of these tests when taken together should be considered anew. If practically every play is placed by this experiment exactly where it must belong, then there is a very strong presumption that any play of which the date is doubtful, or any considerable stratum of a play that underwent revision, belongs where the development in the flexibility of Shakespeare's verse would place it. The table of average percentages follows:

1 H VI	6.3	A Y L	21.4
Titus And	7.7	M W W	22.6
3 H VI	8.	T N	25.5
2 H VI	8.7	T & C	27.5
Shrew	9.8	Oth	29.6
Errors	10.	Haml	32.4
R III	11.8	M for M	33.5
LLL	12.	Per	36.4*
T G of V	12.20	Lear	39.6
John	12.23	Timon	40.
R & J	12.4	A W W	43.9
Dream	12.6	Macb	46.7
R II	12.7	A & C	49.1
1 H IV	14.	Coriol	51.1
2 H IV	18.1	W T	52.6
J C	19.7	Temp	53.8
H V	20.2	Cymb	53.9
M of V	20.4	H VIII	55.3*
Much Ado	20.8		

**Shakespeare scenes.

It is obvious that when plays differ very slightly no conclusion as to their exact sequence can legitimately be drawn, though it is noteworthy that even then the right sequence seems often to be

held. *The Merchant of Venice* is the only play which appears to be notably out of place, and it comes in the right order of the comedies, where a livelier and more natural movement is to be expected. The table upholds the placing of *Titus Andronicus*, if substantially the work of Shakespeare, at the beginning of his career, as Professor Pollard and others are now convinced should be done; but the low percentage of this play and of *1 Henry VI* will be attributed by most critics to their composite authorship. An early date for Shakespeare's share of *Titus* would of course not preclude a certain amount of revision in 1594.

The belief that *The Shrew* was an early play of Shakespeare from which *A Shrew* was derived finds support in the table; for the entire play has the metrical characteristics of Shakespeare's first period. I have checked every scene, and I find that no clear distinction is to be made between the portions that seem to show Shakespeare's revision of 1597 (or thereabouts) and the scenes which were more probably Shakespeare's early work, or those perhaps contributed by a collaborator to the early play. It would follow (if one gives full credence to the table as a test) that Shakespeare added no new matter in the revision, but merely reworded some parts of the Induction and the taming scenes. This refurbishing (if that is what happened) brings those scenes to only 11.07%.

There is a very different story to tell of *Love's Labour's Lost*. The portions which I specified as belonging to the play as Shakespeare first wrote it¹ yield an average of only 8.8 per cent., which places this as the first of the comedies and puts the added material between the two Parts of *Henry IV*. Those who assign this play to 1593 will find that no part of it has the metrical characteristics of that time; though the earlier and later portions when averaged together make it appear so in the table given above. Very much the same thing is true of *Romeo and Juliet*. It is those portions of the Second Quarto which have no equivalent at all in the First which give this drama as a whole its intermediate position in the table. Taken by themselves they show a much higher percentage, placing the final version of the drama about 1597, and sending the play without these additions back to (or toward) 1591.²

¹ *The Original Version of Love's Labour's Lost*, 1918.

² My estimates here have only been sufficient to assure me of this general

A "talking point" is furnished by the table to those who believe that *Julius Caesar* was written in 1598 or 1599, and to those who think that *Hamlet* reached its final form as late as 1603. *All's Well That Ends Well* is carried forward, as I have long been convinced that it should be. Those who believe that *All's Well* is the revised *Love's Labour's Won* are obliged, in the light of these statistics, to test what they consider the earlier stratum of this play, and either show that it is lower by about 30% than the play's average, or account for the anomaly of a wholly different metrical habit in one play and one only of Shakespeare's first period. The "rhyme test" cannot be invoked when the couplets themselves are of a different sort. It would be interesting also to learn just where the "metrical average test" would place the revised portions of this drama.

It is at least possible that in this formulating of Shakespeare's metrical habit we have within reach a criterion of the highest value, and that it is capable of application far beyond the preliminary suggestions that I have here set down. But while we have in the table a source of evidence that cannot be dismissed with an impatient gesture, it is questionable if such evidence can be accepted as final when not supported by other considerations.

HENRY DAVID GRAY

Stanford University

NOTES ON JONSON'S EXECRATION UPON VULCAN

In his *Execration upon Vulcan*, Jonson mentions the loss of "parcels of a Play"; what was this play? For a period of about ten years beginning in 1616, Jonson produced nothing for the legitimate stage. He returned to the drama with the presentation of *The Staple of News* in 1626 (February 2, 1625, O. S.).¹ Dr. De Winter, in his edition of *The Staple of News*, calls attention to the fact that Jonson had suggestions of this play in his mind as early as 1621.² In the masque, *News from the New World*,

fact. A great deal more than belonged to the original play seems to be preserved in Q₁.

¹ *Ben Jonson*, ed. Herford and Simpson, Oxford, 1925, I, 73-74; II, 169.

² *The Staple of News*, ed. De Winter, New York, Holt, 1905, xx.

the Factor says: "And I have hope to erect a Staple for News ere long." De Winter says further that Jonson began work on the *Staple* in 1622, working up the main body of the play in 1623, but revising it up to the time of production. The editors of the Oxford *Jonson* give the date of the *Execration* as November, 1623.³ If Jonson had started work on the *Staple* before this date, and it seems plausible that he had, the play lost in the fire was probably an early draft of portions of the *Staple*. The numerous relationships of the *Execration* and the *Staple*, with the similarity of many lines in *Neptune's Triumph* and the *Staple*, seem to indicate that the works were conceived at about the same time and were probably written at almost the same period. Lines 79-84 of the *Execration* contain several references to subjects taken up in the news satire of the *Staple*: Captaine Pamplet,⁴ the weekly Corrants,⁵ and the Prophet Ball.⁶

The masque *Neptune's Triumph*, written for production in 1624, but delayed until 1625,⁷ has many passages which are almost identical with passages in the *Staple* news satire. De Winter advances the hypothesis that Jonson wrote the passages for the masque and incorporated them into the play.⁸ My own opinion is that he wrote them originally for the play, and when it was destroyed, rewrote them from memory and placed them in the masque. Then when the play was revived for production, Jonson restored those lines which he recollected from the lost early draft. The passages in the *Execration* may have been preserved in the same manner. Jonson's restoration of a number of other works burned at the same time makes it likely that he did the same for the play.⁹

To sum up the points briefly: Jonson was writing a play in 1623 at the latest; there is evidence that he had started *The Staple of News* before this; no other play of his is so closely related to his life and works during this period; he revived other works

³ *Op. cit.*, I, 73.

⁴ *Staple of News*, I, iv, 17.

⁵ See below.

⁶ *Staple of News*, III, ii, 128, and p. 180.

⁷ Herford and Simpson, *op. cit.*, II, 325.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, xx.

⁹ Jonson. *Works*, ed. Gifford (1816), VIII, 419.

destroyed at the same time; hence it is very probable that the lost play was an unfinished draft of the *Staple*. If the *Staple* was the play, it is safe to say that the lost "parcels" were those sections dealing with the staple itself rather than the Pennyboy plot, since all the similarities to the other works are found in these sections.

The relation of the *Execration* and the *Staple* sheds light on the identity of "the weekly Corrants, with *Pauls Seale*." The Oxford editors say of this paper: "By 1623 there was apparently another [news sheet], the *Weekly Courants with Paules Seale*, referred to by Jonson in the 'Execration upon Vulcan,' lines 79-81."¹⁰ However, it is by no means certain that this is the title of the paper, as the folio of 1640 prints only the word "*Pauls*" in italics, and has a comma after "Corrants";¹¹ indeed, Mr. J. B. Williams, in his *History of English Journalism*,¹² says that Jonson is referring to the "Corantos" (early news sheets) in general. This is a logical explanation; but since Jonson is specific in his attack on the Captain, and since he certainly has specific characters in the *Staple* satire, it may be that he has a particular paper or author in mind. If so, Nathaniel Butter, the most prominent figure in early English journalism and the satire which grew around it, and his *Currant of Newes* are the most logical objects of attack. On October 1, 1623, one month before the date of the *Execration*, Butter registered Number 50 of *A Currant of Newes*.¹³ This paper had been issued weekly for a year; the title varied from one issue to the next, but was usually similar to the above, and the numbers were consecutive without regard to the changes in title.

The strongest argument for the identification of Butter's page with the "weekly Corrants" is the series of puns in the *Staple*. The Clerk Nathaniel, identified by De Winter as Butter, is described: "A decayed Stationer he was, who knows Newes well, can sort and ranke 'hem; and for a need can make 'hem. True Paules bred i'the Church-yard."¹⁴ All the news in the *Staple*

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, II, 172.

¹¹ Jonson. *Works* (1640), II, 211.

¹² Pp. 17-18.

¹³ *Stationers' Register*, ed. Arber, IV, 67.

¹⁴ *The Staple of Newes*, ed. De Winter, I, v, 62.

was "to be issu'd under the Seale of the Office, as Staple Newes; no other newes be *currant*,"¹⁵ and was to "come from the mint; fresh and new stamped, with the Office-Seale, Staple Commodity."¹⁶ Butter is called "True Paules," and without the seal, no news is to be "currant." The additional factor of the personal enmity between Jonson and Butter¹⁷ makes it appear even more probable that Jonson was attacking Butter in this instance.

GEORGE BURKE JOHNSTON

Virginia Polytechnic Institute

"TO TURN TURK"

In the seventeenth century the expression 'turn Turk' was used to convey several shades of meaning, one of which seems to have escaped the editors of the *New English Dictionary*. At least three Jacobean dramatists employed the phrase in the special sense which it obviously bears in one of Franceschina's speeches in Marston's *The Dutch Courtesan*:

. . . vat sall become of mine poor flesh now? mine body must *turn Turk* for twopence. (Act II, Scene ii.)

Cf. Dekker's *The Honest Whore*, Part I, Act IV, Scene ii:

Bellafront: Be greater than a king; save not a body,
But from eternal shipwrack keep a soul.
If not, and that again sin's path I tread,
The grief be mine, the guilt fall on thy head!

Hippolito: Stay, and take physie for it; read this book,
Ask counsel of this head, what's to be done;
He'll strike it dead, that 'tis damnation
If you *turn Turk* again. Oh, do it not!
Though Heaven cannot allure you to do well,
From doing ill let hell fright you; and learn this,
The soul whose bosom lust did never touch
Is God's fair bride, and maidens' souls are such:
The soul that leaving chastity's white shore,
Swims in hot sensual streams, is the devil's whore.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I, ii, 13.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, v, 203.

¹⁷ Herford and Simpson, *op. cit.*, II, 203.

and Massinger's *The Renegado*, Act V, Scene iii:

Paulina: . . . I will turn Turk.

Gazet: Most of your tribe do so,
When they begin in whore.

It is worth noting in this connection that *A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew*, published about 1700, glosses *Turkish-shore* as 'Lambeth, Southwark and Roderhith-side of the Water.'¹

These examples may perhaps serve as a commentary upon *Much Ado About Nothing*, Act III, Scene iv:

Beatrice: . . . By my troth, 'I am exceeding ill: heigh^hho!

Margaret: For a hawk, a horse, or a husband?

Beatrice: For the letter that begins them all, H.

Margaret: Well, an you be not turned Turk, there's no more sailing by the star.

Beatrice: What means the fool, trow?

Margaret: Nothing, I; but God send every one their heart's desire!

It is thoroughly in character, certainly, that Margaret's words should carry an innuendo of the sort suggested by the parallels cited above.

WARNER G. RICE

University of Michigan

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *STIR* 'PRISON' AGAIN

In a brief note in *Studies in Honor of Herman Collitz*, published recently by the Johns Hopkins University Press, I suggested that the underworld word *stir* meaning 'prison' should no longer be associated, as in several leading dictionaries, with the verb *stir* 'agitate,' from Old English *styrian*, but rather with the Old English noun *stēor*, *stīer*, *stȳr*, denoting (1) steering, guidance, (2) rule, regulation, (3) restraint, discipline, check, correction. The suggested etymology seems likely enough, and I am unable to find that it has been brought forward hitherto. An objection to it, however, may be found in the gulf of time elapsing between

¹ This book was brought to my attention by Professor C. C. Fries. It was compiled by 'B. E. Gent.' and printed at London. There is no date on the title-page.

the disappearance of the Old English word, in printed monuments, and the emergence of the underworld word in late modern times.

There is another possibility that should be taken into account, that suggested by the familiar tradition of the relation between nineteenth-century slang expressions and the language of the Gypsies. Among the words used by the English Gypsies when a list was made by George Borrow in 1873 (*Romano-Lavo-Lil*, page 61) are *stardo* (past participle) 'imprisoned,' *staripen* 'prison,' *staro-mengro* 'prisoner.' Similar terms appear in other lists of Gypsy words. A derivation of the monosyllabic noun *stir* from the initial syllable of these formations is perhaps less acceptable phonetically than that from the Old English, but it is easily possible and it seems *more* acceptable chronologically. The connection between slang and the speech of the Gypsies is not so close, it may be, nor the debt so great, as was believed in the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, some words in widespread usage—e. g., the familiar *pal*—are credited to the English Gypsies, and *stir* may belong in the same category. Certainly, whether the noun be of native or gypsy origin, a better spelling would be *ster*, dissociating it to the eye from the verb *stir* 'agitate.'

I am indebted to Professor Leonard Bloomfield for the suggestion that the vocabulary of Gypsies be examined.¹

LOUISE POUND

University of Nebraska

VIGNY ET L'AMIRAL COLLINGWOOD

M. Ernest Dupuy¹ a le premier appelé l'attention sur un passage des mémoires d'Auguste Barbier dans lequel l'auteur des *Iambes* rappelle que c'est sur son conseil que Vigny aurait lu un ouvrage

¹ Since this note was written, an article has appeared by J. Dyneley Prince ("A Brazilian Gypsy Dialect," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 50, no. 2, June, 1930) that lists, in a short glossary of terms, "stáripén, stárubén, 'prison,' whence the American slang *stir*, 'prison.'" Dr. Prince, too, has been impressed by the Gypsy word as the probable source of *stir*, the noun. *Stir* seems to appear, however, earlier in the English than in the American underworld jargon, and perhaps it should not be described as "American slang."

¹ *A. de Vigny*, II, 86, n. Paris, s. d.

intitulé: *A Selection from the public and private correspondence of Vice-Admiral Lord Collingwood: interspersed with Memoirs of his life.* By G. L. Newham Collingwood, Esq. F. R. S. 2 vols. London, 1828. Peu après, M. Fernand Baldensperger a comparé de façon très ingénieuse le Collingwood de l'histoire au Collingwood déjà fort embelli qui apparaît dans les *Memoirs*, et au portrait encore plus idéalisé que Vigny a tracé du vieil amiral anglais dans la *Canne de Jonc*.² Plus récemment, M. Baldensperger, ayant cette fois en main les documents originaux, a pu indiquer que Vigny avait dépouillé avec le plus grand soin la publication anglaise et que les notes qu'il y a prises "couvrent plusieurs feuillets de ses manuscrits, avec une pagination se rapportant à l'édition courante." Malgré ces études antérieures, il reste cependant à glaner, et en particulier à déterminer dans le détail non seulement de quelle façon Vigny s'est documenté, mais plus encore comment il a remanié et combiné les matériaux qu'il avait réunis dans ses notes, comment surtout à plusieurs reprises il n'a pas hésité à simplifier et parfois à altérer le sens réel de l'original pour conserver plus d'unité stoïque à la figure du grand marin anglais.

La première mention de Collingwood se trouve dans le chapitre IV qui porte en tête: "Simple lettre. A bord du vaisseau anglais *Le Culloden*, devant Rochefort, 1804. *Sent to France, with Admiral Collingwood's permission.*" Si nous nous reportons aux *Memoirs* nous voyons en effet que Collingwood commanda le *Culloden* qui croisait en vue d'Ouessant en 1804, et qui ne devait quitter les parages du cap Finistère qu'en mai 1805 (*Memoirs*, I, 130, 142).

Dans le même chapitre nous trouvons cette première esquisse du portrait de Collingwood:

C'est un galant homme s'il en fut, qui, depuis 1761 qu'il sert dans la marine, n'a quitté la mer que pendant deux années, pour se marier et mettre au monde ses deux filles. Ces enfants dont il parle sans cesse, ne le connaissent pas. . . .

La date de l'entrée au service de Collingwood est exacte (*Memoirs*, I, 8), le reste l'est moins: mais Vigny veut dès maintenant indiquer le thème qu'il reprendra deux chapitres plus loin. En fait Collingwood lui-même nous indique que de 1786 à 1790, il resta à terre dans le

² *La mer et les marins dans l'œuvre de Vigny*, dans *Alfred de Vigny. Contribution à sa biographie intellectuelle*. Paris, 1912.

Northumberland; après un bref voyage aux Antilles en 1790, il revint en Angleterre, se maria bientôt, devint l'heureux père de deux filles, "Sarah, née en mai 1792, et Mary Patience, née en 1793" (*Memoirs*, I, 22). Si nous continuons l'étude des mémoires nous voyons que Collingwood "was permitted to return to his family for a few weeks in January 1799" (*Memoirs*, I, 103), qu'il revit sa femme et sa fille aînée en février 1801 (*Memoirs*, I, 115), et qu'il resta de nouveau dans sa maison de campagne à Morpeth de février 1802 à la conclusion de la paix d'Amiens. Il ne s'embarqua de nouveau qu'au printemps de 1803 (I, 122).

Au chapitre VI. *Un homme de mer*, Vigny va nous tracer un portrait en pied de l'amiral :

Il avait à la main sa lunette de nuit et il était vêtu de son grand uniforme avec la rigide tenue anglaise. . . . Je remarquai un air de mélancolie profonde dans ses grands yeux noirs et sur son front. Ses cheveux blancs, à demi poudrés, tombaient assez négligemment sur ses oreilles.

C'est bien ainsi que Collingwood est représenté dans la gravure qui sert de frontispice aux *Memoirs*; on y retrouvera non seulement la lunette de nuit, le grand uniforme, mais encore les cheveux blancs, rares et assez négligés cachant à demi les oreilles. Quand aux grands yeux noirs et à l'expression du visage, on les retrouvera dans le passage suivant: "He had a full dark eye, and, although in his latter years his fine countenance became faded with toil and care, it was ever strongly expressive of his character, for it was marked with thoughtfulness, and benevolence" (*Memoirs*, II, 410).

M. Baldensperger remarque que "bien loin de s'inquiéter de former et d'affermir, au-dessous de lui, de jeunes âmes militaires, il observe même qu'il ne trouve pas le temps à bord de l'*Océan*, de s'occuper des officiers débutants et qu'il ne sait pas le nom de trois *midshipmen* sous ses ordres" (*A. de Vigny*, p. 129). On voit en effet Collingwood déclarer à la fin de sa carrière: "I seldom see any of them, and I do not know the names of three midshipmen on the ship" (*Memoirs*, II, 240). Mais ailleurs l'amiral avait dit: "When I was Captain of a frigate I took good care of them; now I cannot and have not time to know any thing about them" (*Memoirs*, I, 296); et son biographe avait dit: "He treated the Midshipmen with parental care, examining them himself once a week" (*Memoirs*, I, 75). Vigny a donc attribué aux dernières années de son héros un

trait emprunté à une partie antérieure de sa carrière. Il le fera plus d'une fois.

Un peu plus loin, M. Baldensperger remarque que le bon marin, un peu étroit, que fut Collingwood, n'aurait pas été tenté, comme le veut Vigny, de pratiquer assidûment Shakespeare en même temps que le capitaine Cook. "Je vous prêterai Shakespeare et le capitaine Cook." Nous le verrons plus loin cependant recommander à ses filles de lire des "travels, essays, and Shakespeare's plays, as often as they please" (*Memoirs*, II, 25), et il semble bien que Vigny ait dans ce cas utilisé deux fois le même passage.

Dans le passage où Collingwood indique comment, à distance, il dirige l'éducation de ses filles, on trouvera un résumé extrêmement condensé de sa correspondance avec sa femme et sa fille aînée Sarah. Le cri de la fin: "Eh bien! tout cela n'est rien, parce qu'elles ne me voient pas," semble un écho de la lettre de l'amiral à un de ses amis: "My daughters can never be to me what yours have been . . . it is not reasonable to expect that they should have the same feeling for a person of whom they have only heard . . ." (*Memoirs*, I, 112).

Par contre Vigny s'écarte nettement de son modèle quand il fait déclarer à l'amiral: "Oui, Sarah ne s'est jamais assise sur mes genoux que lorsqu'elle avait deux ans, et je n'ai tenu Mary dans mes bras que lorsque ses yeux n'étaient pas ouverts encore." Sarah, née en 1792, et Mary, née en 1793, ont pu, comme nous l'avons indiqué plus haut, voir leur père en 1799 et passer plus d'une année avec lui, de février 1802 au printemps de 1803. Collingwood lui-même avait d'ailleurs écrit: "Since 1793 I have been only one year at home. To my own children I am scarcely known" (*Memoirs*, I, 124), et cette dernière phrase semble bien avoir inspiré le "Elles diront: *Nous ne connaissons pas notre père!*", tandis que Vigny laissait tomber la première, qui aurait apporté une atténuation.

D'autres fois les *Memoirs* sont utilisés pour un simple trait, ainsi quand Renaud décrit les "journées mélancoliques de la mer": "Quand un navire passait près ou loin de nous, c'est qu'il était anglais: aucun autre n'avait permission de se livrer au vent, et l'Océan n'entendait plus une parole qui ne fût anglaise. Les Anglais même en étaient attristés et se plaignaient qu'à présent l'Océan fût devenu un désert où ils se rencontraient éternellement, et l'Europe une forteresse qui leur était fermée." Voici maintenant Collingwood:

"At sea there is no getting intelligence, as there used to be on former occasions, for now there is not a trading ship upon the seas—nothing but ourselves. It is lamentable to see what a desert the waters become. . . . It has made me almost crazy" (*Memoirs*, II, 117).

Par contre, le portrait de Collingwood qui vient immédiatement après est une véritable mosaïque composée de phrases ou de fragments de phrases habilement choisis. Voici quelques parallélismes frappants: "Il passait les nuits tout habillé, assis sur ses canons, ne cessant de calculer l'art de tenir son navire immobile."—"I have been often a week without my clothes off, and was sometimes upon deck the whole night (*Memoirs*, I, 127). Very frequently we have slept together on a gun, from which Admiral Collingwood would rise from time to time to sweep the horizon with his night-glass, lest the enemy should escape in the dark." (*Memoirs*, I, 126). "Cet homme n'avait joui d'aucune richesse; et tandis qu'on le nommait pair d'Angleterre il aimait sa soupière d'étain comme un matelot." Collingwood reçut la pairie après Trafalgar (*Memoirs*, I, 215); il écrivait à sa femme peu après: "How are we going to make it out in peace, I know not, with high rank and no fortune" (*Memoirs*, I, 225). Pour "la soupière d'étain", la vérité est que Collingwood loin de l'aimer déplorait le fait que toute sa vaisselle eût été perdue ou brisée dans ses courses errantes: "My soup is served in a tin pan, and I have borrowed a pewter tea-pot for my breakfast; but I hope I shall soon get some things from Plymouth, as I have sent for them long" (*Memoirs*, I, 299).

"Il écrivait à ses filles de ne pas être de belles dames, de lire, non des romans, mais l'histoire, des voyages, des essais et Shakespeare tant qu'il leur plairait."—"Do not let our girls be made fine ladies; but give them a knowledge of the world which they have to live in, . . . they must do every thing for themselves, and never read novels, but history, travels, essays, and Shakespeare's plays, as often as they please." (*Memoirs*, II, 26.)

Il écrivait: "Nous avons combattu le jour de la naissance de ma petite Sarah. Après la bataille de Trafalgar que j'eus la douleur de lui voir gagner, et dont il avait tracé le plan avec son ami Nelson à qui il succéda." Le rôle joué par Collingwood à Trafalgar, son amitié pour Nelson, tout cela est en partie exact;—le reste l'est beaucoup moins. La bataille de Trafalgar fut livrée le 21

octobre 1805, or Collingwood qui à plusieurs reprises a envoyé ses vœux pour "many happy returns of the day" à sa petite Sarah, l'a toujours fait le 28 mai, jour anniversaire de la naissance de l'enfant" (*Memoirs*, I, 306). C'est donc en vain que l'on chercherait mention de cette curieuse coïncidence dans la relation de la bataille qui se trouve dans les *Memoirs*; mais si nous nous reportons onze ans en arrière, nous verrons dans une lettre datée en vue de Barfleur, le 5 juin 1794, que quelques jours auparavant Collingwood avait eu le plaisir d'engager la bataille avec quelques navires français qu'il avait aperçus "the morning of little Sarah's birthday, between eight and nine o'clock" (*Memoirs*, I, 26).

Le paragraphe suivant offre une curieuse combinaison de détails exacts, d'anachronismes et d'embellissements artistiques:

Quelquefois il sentait sa santé s'affaiblir, il demandait grâce à l'Angleterre; mais l'inexorable lui répondait: *Restez en mer*, et lui envoyait une dignité ou une médaille d'or pour chaque belle action; sa poitrine en était surchargée. Il écrivait encore: "Depuis que j'ai quitté mon pays, je n'ai pas passé *dix jours* dans un port, mes yeux s'affaiblissent; quand je pourrai voir mes enfants, la mer m'aura rendu aveugle. Je gémis de ce que sur tant d'officiers il est si difficile de me trouver un remplaçant supérieur en habileté." L'Angleterre répondait: *Vous resterez en mer, toujours en mer*. Et il y resta jusqu'à sa mort.

Le bon amiral n'était pas peu fier d'être l'amiral le plus décoré de la flotte anglaise: "We are to have the medals for the last action, and I do not despair of getting another soon. I am the only officer in the service with three" (*Memoirs*, May 22, 1806, I, 307). Je n'ai trouvé nulle part l'indication des *dix jours*; au contraire Collingwood dut à plusieurs reprises faire relâche pour faire réparer ses vaisseaux, conduire des négociations diplomatiques, faire des visites de courtoisie. Mais l'on trouve les indications suivantes dont Vigny a pu s'inspirer: "Except for the short time the Ocean was under repair at Malta, I have been at sea ever since you left this country" (To Captain Clavell, Oct. 20, 1809. *Memoirs*, II, 387.) Cette escale de Malte dura d'ailleurs du 4 janvier au 5 février 1809 (*Memoirs*, II, 287, 305). Ailleurs: "I have been only on shore once since I left England, and I do not know when I shall go again" (1^{er} janvier 1806, *Memoirs*, I, 229). Enfin Collingwood fit naufrage dans les Antilles et resta *dix jours* sur un rocher de corail en 1780 (*Memoirs*, I, 11). Dans la dernière partie de sa vie

Collingwood se plaint si souvent de l'affaiblissement de sa vue qu'il est difficile de choisir: "my eyes are very feeble" (*Memoirs*, II, 333)—"My eyes are so old and so weak that you will have a great deal to do for me" (To his daughter Sarah, August 12, 1808, *Memoirs*, II, 215). Quand Lord Mulgrave lui refuse son congé, il écrit: "The impression which his letter made upon me was one of grief and sorrow: first, that with such a list as we have, there should be any difficulty in finding a successor of superior ability to me" (*Memoirs*, II, 276, November 8, 1808).

Voici maintenant un autre exemple de mosaïque:

Je lui vis écrire un jour: "Maintenir l'indépendance de mon pays est la première volonté de ma vie, et j'aime mieux que mon corps soit ajouté au rempart de la patrie que traîné dans une pompe inutile, à travers une foule oisive. Ma vie et mes forces sont dues à l'Angleterre—Ne parlez pas de ma blessure on croirait que je me glorifie de mes blessures.

La première phrase représente une condensation du passage suivant:

Our country requires that great exertions should be made to maintain its independence and its glory. . . . What my heart is most bent on, is the glory of my Country. To stand a barrier between the ambition of France and the independence of England is the first wish of my life; and in death, I would rather that my body, if it were possible, should be added to the rampart, than trailed in useless pomp through an idle throng" (*Memoirs*, II, 108).

La seconde phrase traduit probablement, "my best service is due to my country as long as I live" (*Memoirs*, II, 270). La troisième nous reporte à une date antérieure à laquelle Collingwood, après avoir annoncé qu'il avait été blessé par un éclat de bois, ajoutait "Pray do not talk about the wound in my leg, or people may think that I am vapouring about my dangers" (*Memoirs*, I, 307).

Renaud a pu voir les "Rois du Midi" demander la protection de l'amiral anglais, comme le montrent des lettres non seulement du roi et de la reine de Naples, mais encore des pétitions du Bey de Tunis, du Pacha d'Egypte et d'"Ali Pacha de Joannina." Si Napoléon a pu "s'émouvoir de l'espoir que Collingwood était dans les mers de l'Inde," c'est que dans les *Memoirs* de l'amiral nous trouvons que "Mon opinion est," says Napoleon more than once, "que Collingwood est parti, et est allé aux Grandes Indes" (I, 145).

Dans la scène finale où Collingwood se sépare de son jeune prisonnier qui va être échangé, Vigny emprunte encore quelques traits aux *Memoirs*: "Cela ne durera plus bien longtemps," dit l'Amiral; "je sens mes jambes trembler sous moi et maigrir. Pour la quatrième fois, j'ai demandé le repos à lord Mulgrave, et il m'a dit encore qu'il ne sait comment me remplacer." La phrase traduite ici non sans une légère transposition est la suivante: "My eyes are very feeble; my legs and feet swell so much every day, that it is pretty clear they will not last long" (*Memoirs*, II, 333). La réponse de lord Mulgrave est en réalité celle faite à la première demande de congé présentée par l'amiral: "I had before mentioned my declining health to Lord Mulgrave, and he tells me in reply, that he hopes I will stay, for he knows not how to supply my place" (*Memoirs*, II, 276, November 8, 1808). Enfin, on peut encore ajouter que Collingwood mourut bien "en pleine mer, comme il avait vécu durant quarante-neuf ans, sans se plaindre ni se glorifier, et sans avoir revu ses deux filles." Les *Memoirs* nous apprennent en effet que, se sentant incapable de s'acquitter plus longtemps de sa tâche, il confia son commandement au contre-amiral Martin et quitta Port Mahon le 4 mars 1810, sur la *Ville de Paris* pour retourner en Angleterre. Il mourut en mer, le soir du 7, à l'âge de cinquante-neuf ans et six mois, après avoir exprimé le regret de n'avoir pu "une dernière fois rencontrer les Français" (*Memoirs*, II, 407).

Il n'est pas sans intérêt de constater que le procédé de composition employé par Alfred de Vigny dans cet épisode est précisément celui dont avait fait usage de façon constante l'auteur d'*Atala*, de *René*, et des *Martyrs*. Comme Chateaubriand, Vigny a cru devoir se documenter avec un soin scrupuleux du détail; mais comme Chateaubriand il se soucie peu de la chronologie. Il a volontairement négligé tout ce qui aurait pu détruire l'unité grandiose de son personnage: ses plaintes continuelles contre la stupidité de l'ami-rauté, son irritation devant le manque de patriotisme des marchands de la Cité, sa haine de Bonaparte, sa passion mal déguisée pour les médailles et les titres, les platitudes moralisatrices qu'il accumule dans ses lettres, son naïf orgueil; il a même refusé de recueillir quantité de détails familiers, sentimentaux, ou simplement humains, bien dans le goût du dix-huitième siècle.

Il a fait un "Romain" de cet Anglais qui adore la campagne,

recommande de planter des chênes pour que l'Angleterre ne manque jamais de bois pour ses vaisseaux; il a attribué à Collingwood vieilli, courbé sur sa table de travail, préoccupé d'écrire ses rapports à l'amirauté, des traits empruntés à une période antérieure de sa vie. Il a élevé son héros au-dessus de l'humanité moyenne pour en faire un type représentatif ou plutôt un symbole, et c'est peut-être à cette transformation qu'il avait fait subir au caractère de Collingwood qu'il pensait quand il écrivait dans son *Journal*: "Je crois, ma foi, que je ne suis qu'une sorte de moraliste épique."

GILBERT CHINARD

The Johns Hopkins University

THE DATE OF PERIBÁÑEZ Y EL COMENDADOR
DE OCAÑA

Lope de Vega's practice of including himself occasionally among the minor *dramatis personae* of his plays is well known.¹ In Act III, Scene v, of *Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña* he appears under the usual pseudonym *Belardo* in order to address his audience directly. In doing this he seems to have had three purposes: to take a gentle fling at his critics, who had been indulging in personalities; to make known to the public his desire to mend his ways, forgetting his past loves and lusts and turning to a life of devotion; and to announce, in veiled terms, his forthcoming epic, the *Jerusalem conquistada*. It is a difficult scene, and should be studied in connection with all of the *Belardo* scenes scattered through Lope's theater. In the present article I shall merely present the hypothesis that the last four lines of the scene are an allusion to the *Jerusalem conquistada*, on the basis of which it is possible to date the play more accurately than heretofore.

Professor Hugo A. Rennert, in his *Life of Lope de Vega*,² after quoting *Belardo*'s references to his age and to his connection with the Church, drew the following conclusion:

¹ H. Rennert y A. Castro, *Vida de Lope de Vega*, Madrid, 1919, p. 221, note 1.

² Glasgow, 1904, p. 215.

If Lope was really forty-two years old at this time, then the play was written in 1604; but he had not entered the Church, nor any religious order, as early as this. He joined the Congregation of the Calle del Olivar in 1610, as we have seen. It is more likely, therefore, that this *comedia* was written between 1610 and 1614.³

This passage was translated without alteration in the *Vida de Lope de Vega* already cited,⁴ in spite of the fact that this book contains a statement which invalidates the year 1610 as a *terminus a quo*:

En el verano de 1609 ingresó Lope en la Congregación de Esclavos del Santísimo Sacramento en el oratorio del Caballero de Gracia.⁵

But here again there is need for correction. The only authority for the words just quoted appears to be Navarrete, who in his *Vida de Cervantes*⁶ claims to have had documentary evidence that

Lope en efecto era ya sacerdote a lo menos desde 1608, y al año siguiente entró de cofrade en la congregación de esclavos del santísimo Sacramento del oratorio del Caballero de Gracia, donde celebró la misa de la festividad de *Primer domingo de mes* en agosto de 1609, según consta de un acuerdo que firmado de él existe en su archivo. En 24 de enero de 1610 entró también en la del oratorio de la calle del Olivar. . . .

This assertion is a combination of error and fact. Lope could not have said mass in August of 1609, as has been conclusively shown by Rennert and Castro;⁷ but he did belong to the Congregación del Oratorio del Caballero de Gracia, for in addition to the "acuerdo" found by Navarrete we have the testimony of the *Fama Póstuma* of Pérez de Montalbán.⁸ The *constituciones* of this brotherhood were approved by the Archbishop of Toledo on November 13, 1609;⁹ but the organization must have come into existence many months earlier, and Lope may well have been a charter member. La Barrera was quite right when he left in doubt the whole question as to when Lope joined this brotherhood:

³ The play was first published in 1614.

⁴ Rennert and Castro, *loc. cit.*

⁵ P. 196. Schack follows Navarrete.

⁶ Madrid, 1819, p. 468.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 196, note 1, and Cap. IX.

⁸ Ed. Madrid, Hernando, 1921, pp. 13-14. (Biblioteca Universal. Colección de los Mejores Autores antiguos y modernos, Tomo xxv.)

⁹ Navarrete, *op. cit.*, pp. 476-477; La Barrera, "Nueva biografía de Lope de Vega," in *Obras de L. de V.*, I (Madrid, 1890), 163-164.

Iguoramos si fué por aquel tiempo cuando se alistó . . . en la congregación . . . fundada en la Iglesia de monjas franciscanas recoletas de la Concepción, calle que se denominó del Caballero de Gracia.¹⁰

All of this argumentation leads up to the main point of the present article: namely, that the year 1610 cannot be accepted as a *terminus a quo*,¹¹ and that the last four lines of the scene of *Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña* which we are now considering make it possible to assign the play definitely to the first months of the year 1609.

The situation is well known to all readers of Lope. In answer to the summons of King Enrique III, two companies of men at arms, one composed of *hidalgos* and another of *labradores*, are leaving Ocaña to take part in an expedition against the Moors. As the companies march off, Peribáñez, Blas and Belardo detach themselves from the body of peasants to linger a moment beneath a balcony occupied by Casilda, Peribáñez's bride, and her two companions, Inés and Costanza. Casilda gives her husband a ribbon as a favor, Blas receives a *cinta de perro* from Costanza, and Inés asks:

Inés: ¿No pides favor, Belardo?

Belardo: Inés, por soldado viejo,
Ya que no por nuevo amante,
De tus manos le merezco.

Inés: Tomad aqueste chapín.

Belardo: No, Señora, deteneldo;
Que favor de chapinazo
Desde tan alto, no es bueno.

Inés: Traedme un moro, Belardo.

Belardo: Días ha que ando tras ellos.
Mas, si no viniere en prosa,
Desde aquí le ofrezco en verso.¹²

It cannot be proved that we have here a reference to the *Jerusalem conquistada*; but only when so interpreted do the lines acquire meaning, and the conjecture is so illuminating, and fits the known

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 163-164.

¹¹ This fact was realized by Professor M. A. Buchanan, who listed *Peribáñez* among "Lope's Dated Plays" as belonging to the period 1609-1614, *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Plays*, in University of Toronto Studies, Philological Series, No. 6, Toronto, The University Library, 1922, p. 20.

¹² Ed. Hartzenbusch, Rivadeneyra, xli, 296.

facts so perfectly, that it seems to justify this article. What did Lope mean by a "moro?" And by the words "si no viniere en prosa?" I suggest that we interpret: "Ya que no he de traeros un moro de carne y hueso (en prosa), os le ofrezco fingido y en verso."

Let us examine the known facts. Lope had indeed been concerned with his epic "for many days," for the manuscript had been completed prior to September 3, 1605, as we learn from a letter to Sessa, in which the poet expresses his desire to rush the work through the press;¹³ but difficulties presented themselves, with resulting delay. The permission to print was dated August 23, 1608; and it was not until February, 1609, that the book left the press of Juan de la Cuesta in Madrid.¹⁴ It is to this latter date, approximately, that we should in all probability assign *Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña*. As the poem was being placed on public sale, the author sought to pique the curiosity and arouse the interest of his audience. The date 1605 is necessarily excluded by the fact that at that time Lope had joined no religious brotherhood.¹⁵

OTIS H. GREEN

University of Pennsylvania

OLD SPANISH TERMS OF SMALL VALUE

In the May, 1929, issue of *MLN.*, pp. 323-324, Professor G. I. Dale refers to my article of May, 1927, under the above title, in his article entitled "The Figurative Negative in Old Spanish."

¹³ La Barrera, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

¹⁴ Pérez Pastor, *Bibliografía madrileña*, II, 171-172.

¹⁵ Of course, Lope was a Familiar of the Inquisition at least as early as 1608, as we learn from the *privilegio* and the *portada* of the *Jerusalem conquistada*; and Fitzmaurice-Kelly (*Hist. de la Lit. Esp.*, 1921, p. 224) regarded this as perhaps a first indication of Lope's change of heart. But this position appears to have been purely honorary (La Barrera, *op. cit.*, p. 148); and the secular (not to say infamous) character of many of the Familiars has been made clear by Henry C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of Spain*, I (Philadelphia, 1906), 446 ff. Lope may have become a Familiar out of true devotion, but we have no means of knowing his motive. I do not believe that Lope's connection with the Inquisition can explain Belardo's words "a la Iglesia me acogí."

Some of the information he adds has already been called to my attention, especially the *figo* in *Mio Cid*, which I had overlooked, and which has given rise to a misunderstanding of the adjective "rustic." My aim was (1) to classify the terms regardless of their syntactical use, and (2) to point out that a considerable proportion of them had been taken from the fruit and vegetable vocabulary. These were the "rustic similes" in Group I. The three instances of *dinero* in *Mio Cid*—not quoted in my article—would belong to Group II, and the adjective "rustic" would not apply to them.

It had struck me as curious that the author of the *Cantar de Mio Cid* should not use the words of Group I at all—with but one exception, and there the word is not used by the hero, but by a lesser personage; that the thirteenth and fourteenth-century *mester de clerecía* should use them frequently—especially Gonzalo de Berceo and Juan Ruiz; and that the *Poema de Alfonso Onceno* should have but one case of *figo*. To explain the predilection of the clerics for these rustic similes I suggested that it may be due to their environment in the days when fruit and vegetables were articles of barter. This seems to be borne out by the following line:

E muchas otras fructas de diversas monedas, Mil, 4d.

In the sixteenth century the Inca Garcilaso informs us in *El Reino de los Incas del Perú* about the value of agricultural products in the following range of values: *trigo*, *garbanzo*, *haba*, *mijo*. The Aztecs used cacao beans as money, hence the phrase: *No vale un cacao, un cacahuete*.¹ Cervantes uses it in *La Gitanilla*: "No lo estimamos en un cacao."

With a complete list of these terms in Old Spanish a study could be made of the changes between the Old Spanish and modern usage. It is true that these terms have been treated, but always in a vague and incomplete manner. Menéndez Pidal in the *Cid* vocabulary under *figo* quotes FnGz, 181; Apolonio, 230; Sildef, 11; JRz, 626, 359, 1366; Alf. Onceno, 798. On p. 376 he says: "Los sustantivos de objetos despreciables que refuerzan la negación—here he translates Diez's *Verstärkung der Negation*—no estaban en la Edad Media excluidos del estilo elevado, como hoy 'comino,

¹ MPh., xxiii (1926), 349-353. See also José María Asencio y Toledo, *Relaciones de Yucatán* (Colección de documentos inéditos de ultramar), Madrid, 1898, I, 339.

ardite, pito, pizca, tres caracoles, bleado,' 'todo esto non vale uno figo,' Auto Magos 8, 'non preçio contra uos todo lo al un figo' Alex 898, 'vn dinero' Mio Cid 252, SMill, 127. Estos sustantivos llevaban a menudo un adjetivo para rebajar más su valor: 'un dinero malo,' Mio Cid 503, 'un puies foradado' Milg 666, 'sendos rabos' Duelo 197. Abundan los sustantivos análogos como 'hun viento, vn riso, huna mançana madura' SMEgipc 105, 191, 912, 'un moxquito' SanTob 286."—These (except *mançana*) would belong to my Group III. He refers to W. W. Comfort; Diez, III, 398; Meyer-Lübke, III, § 639; Foerster, *Span. Sprachlehre*, p. 312. In the *Clásicos Castellanos* edition he says in a note: "'Non val un figo' y otras expresiones semejantes ('un moxquito, una mançana,' etc.) no estaban excluidas en la literatura medioeval del estilo elevado, como lo están hoy las frases correspondientes (no me importa un comino, un ardite, tres pitos, etc.). Aparecen usadas en todos los buenos autores, como Berceo, el Alexandre, el Arcipreste de Hita."

This presents the situation neither exhaustively nor accurately. The isolated cases of *figo* in *Mio Cid* and *Alfonso Onceno* show that the use of the terms was almost exclusive in the *mester de clerecía* for reasons suggested by me. Professor Dale says that the scholars mentioned by Menéndez Pidal "cite practically all the words included in my list in addition to as many more overlooked by me." My list has 22 terms and 44 quotations. The terms I do not list are 7: *mançana*, *puies foradado*, *gota*, *agallas*, *piñones*, *cannaveras*, *cabello*, plus 4 quoted by Menéndez Pidal as stated above. Diez has also *un negro de uña* from *Don Quix.*, 1, 20, and *dos pajas* from JEnz, 48, but these are not Old Spanish. Of the modern terms he only has *bledo*, *comino*, *ardite*. If we add *pera* and *pan* in Meyer-Lübke, the total of 13 is not as many as 22. Menéndez Pidal has 19 quotations, Diez 12. Comfort lists only *arveja* and *meaja* in Old Spanish, though he is very exhaustive in modern Spanish. To the quotations for Group III I may add:

Menos valien que cuchos los bocudos alanes, StaOria, 197d

and the following examples of terms already mentioned:

Mas nol enpedecieron valient una erveia, Mil, 505d

Toda su maestría non valie una hava, Mil, 591d

Non valdrás mas por esso quanto vale un figo, Mil, 341d

Partió quanto avia, non li fincó dinero, Mil, 9d

With the additional six cases—I include “sendos rabos” quoted by Menéndez Pidal—the total would reach 15 instead of 9 as stated by me in note 2 in my previous article. Menéndez Pidal’s statement might, therefore, be qualified: “Es de notar que abundan en el *mester de clerecía*, probablemente a causa del ambiente en que vivían los autores. Hay sólo un caso de *figo* en *Mio Cid* y uno en *Alfonso Onceno*, además de tres casos de *dinero* en *Mio Cid*.”

Meyer-Lübke does not seem to agree with W. W. Comfort, nor follow Diez whom Menéndez Pidal follows, as does Hanssen in his grammar. In his *Grammatik*, III, 743, § 693, he says: “Von grosser Wichtigkeit sind die *Füllwörter der Negation*, d. h. Substantiva, die die kleinste Menge angeben, deren Beeinflussung durch ein Thun verneint werden soll,” and in Old Spanish quotes *pera*, Berceo, S. Mill, 407, *haba*, Mil, 591, *arvejas*, Hita, 328, *figo*, 349, “alle nur mit *valer* verbunden,” *dos pinnonnes*, Hita, 638, *grano*, Berceo, Sil., 262, *un pan*, Lo.Sen., 161, *dinero*, Berceo, Lo.Sen., 176, *una nues*, Hita, 358. Among the modern he only lists *bledo*. The French translation, instead of using “cheville,” says in III, 774, § 693: “Grande est l’importance des termes qui complètent la négation,” a phenomenon discussed by me elsewhere.² The French translation of Diez, III, 396, is better: “Renforcement de la négation pleine.” Hanssen, § 643, *Refuerzos de negación*, lists *un caracol*. Comfort is fairly complete in the modern Spanish expressions: *bledo*, *castaña*, *comino* (cf. Pereda), *miaja* (cf. *La Malquerida*), *pepino* (cf. *Gil Blas*), *ardite*, *pizca*, *clavo*, *pitoche*, *demonio*, *papel de fumar*.

It sounds true that “a pot with a hole in it is practically useless,” but much depends on the location and the shape of the hole. The Latin *testum* (in Ovid and Petronius) could not have had a hole in the bottom, but only on the top. As a matter of fact, the word first meant the cover of the pot. This the Spanish *tiesto* (Catalán and Mallorquí *test*) usually has. My definition was based on the *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada* (“siempre con un agujero”), and I have no reason to doubt that this type of flower-pot was known in the days of Berceo.³ The adjective *foradado*

² *AJP.*, XLIX (1928), 378 ff.

³ Eguílaz y Yanguas in his *Diccionario etimológico*, p. 506, suggests the Arabic *ṭist*, *ṭišt* < Pers. *tišt* “pelvis,” with reference to Ibn Baṭūṭa, iv, 145. Properly vocalized *ṭast*, this word means “brass basin.” It seems doubtful to me that Berceo had this sort of vessel in mind. Lanchetas does

(Diez has *forarada* by error, "ausgeackerte Nuss," French translation, III, 399, has correctly *nuez foradada* [noix vide]) has the connotation of "bored through," "perforated by a worm," "worm-eaten": otherwise a nut with a hole in it is not useless, unless it be *vide*.

In conclusion I repeat my suggestion that a complete study of this subject be made, covering the whole Romance field. Since writing the above there was published in Madrid, 1929, an interesting study by E. L. Llorens, *La negación en español antiguo, con referencias a otros idiomas*. In his review of this book in *MPh*, xxvii (1930), 506, Professor Hayward Keniston calls attention to H. R. Lang's contribution in *MLN*, I (1886), 127-129, in which reference is made to the same author's article in *AJP*, vi (1885), 80; where the terms under discussion are dealt with as "nouns taking the place of indefinite pronouns, mostly connected with a negation." His *collectanea* add several additional words to those previously mentioned. For O.Sp.: *dinarada*, Cid 64, *feste*, JR, 461, *gallo*, Alex, 637, *gorrión*, Alex, 624, *dos motes*, JR, 1451, *nano*, Alex 1860, *pugesada*, SMill, 332, *puntada*, Duelo, 160, *çapato*, SIIdf, Apol, 314, *un vaso dagua*, Alex, 2462, *un acento*, Alex, 40, *tres aulanas*, Alex, 237, *sennos cabrones*, Alex, 1942, *una castanna*, FGz, 177, *dos castannas*, JR, 1096, *çeresa*, Alex, 1763, *çermenna*, JR, 231, *un clavo*, Alex, 2411, Alf. Onc, 355, *un canto de dinero*, JR, 1245. For mod. Sp.: *brizna*, *burba*, *blanca*, *cabrahigo*, *cacao*, *cantueso*, *dedito*, *ostugo*, *tilde* (all from Cervantes), *adarme*, *apice*, *orégano*, *pico*, *anís*, *jota*, *moco de pavo* (*Caracol*, *pepino*, *pizca*, *pito* have already been mentioned).

In view of this information Group I should be divided into: a) fruit and vegetables; b) animals and birds. Of the O.Sp. words only *castaña*, *clavo*, *pito*, *meaja*, *chinbía* (Pereda) seem to have survived in modern usage.

A. R. NYKL

The University of Chicago

not list the word in his *Vocabulario*. Samuel Birch, *History of Ancient Pottery*, London, 1873, p. 143, speaks of flower-pots of earthenware used by the ancients. "The use of flower-pots placed at the windows to form an artificial garden was also known." In the Musée Lavigerie at Carthage there is a large number of pots with a hole in the bottom, dating from the Roman period. The Slovak *drotár* (better known under the German term *Rastelbinder*) used to wander, in the pre-war days, all over Central Europe, restoring broken pots to usefulness.

D. ANTONIO GIL Y ZÁRATE'S BIRTH-DATE

Manuals of Spanish literature are in disagreement with regard to the birth of the Spanish dramatist, D. Antonio Gil y Zárate. Some cite Dec. 1, 1793, while just as many others cite Dec. 1, 1796. This disagreement harks back to the lifetime of the author, when several modest biographical articles were published. Studies by Revilla¹ and Ferrer del Río,² and one by Ochoa,³ give December 1, 1793, as the date of his birth, while Ochoa, in an earlier work,⁴ gives the date as Dec. 1, 1796. Blanco García,⁵ who asserts that he had the *partida de bautismo* before him, gives the latter date as well. All of these writers agree that the author of *Guzmán el Bueno* was born in El Escorial; but the Marqués de Valmar, probably confusing the native town of Gil y Zárate's father, Bernardo Gil, with that of the dramatist, says that he was born in the Real Sitio de San Ildefonso.⁶

The *partida de bautismo* states that Gil y Zárate was born in El Escorial on Dec. 1, 1793, and on the following day was baptized in the church of San Bernabé. The registration of the birth and baptism of Gil y Zárate, found in the records of the church San Bernabé (book beginning 1789 and ending 1805, folio 157, verso), reads as follows:

En la Parroquial de San Bernabé de esta Va. del Escorial, en dos de Dicie. de mill setos y noventa y tres. Yo Dn Laureano Gómez Mojena, Pro de dicha Va con Lica de Dn Antonio Rodriguez, cura de dicha Parroquial puse los santos óleos y Bape solemne a un niño qe nació en el Rl sitio de Sn Lorenzo en uno de dicho mes y año a las ocho y ma de la mañana á quien puse pr ne Antonio Pedro Natalio, hijo lemo de Bernardo Antonio

¹ J. de la Revilla, "Gil y Zárate," *Galería de españoles célebres contemporáneos o biografías y retratos de todos los personajes distinguidos de nuestros días*, publicada por D. Nicomedes Pastor Díaz y D. Francisco de Cárdenas (Madrid: Boix, 1846), III, 3.

² A. Ferrer del Río, *Galería de la literatura española* (Madrid, 1846), 113.

³ A. Gil y Zárate, *Obras dramáticas*, ed. Ochoa (Paris: Baudry, 1850), VI.

⁴ E. de Ochoa, *Apuntes para una biblioteca de escritores españoles contemporáneos en prosa y verso* (Paris: Baudry, 1840), II, 89.

⁵ F. Blanco García, *La literatura española en el siglo XIX* (3rd ed., Madrid, 1909), I, 248; also (2nd ed., Madrid, 1899), I, 248.

⁶ Marqués de Valmar, Introduction to "*Guzmán el Bueno*," *Autores dramáticos contemporáneos y joyas del teatro español del siglo XIX*, con un prólogo de D. Antonio Cánovas del Castillo (Madrid, 1882), II, 224.

Gil, natl de Sn Ildefonso y Antonio Zárate Aguirre y Murguia natl de Barcelona: Abuelos paternos Basilio Gil natl de Santa Maria de Nieva obispado de Segovia y Ana Aguado, natl de Pinilla Ambras obispado de Segovia. Maternos Pedro Zárate Aguirre y Murguia y Franca Valles natles de dicho Barcelona: Fué su madrina Ana Aguado á quien advertí el Parencº Espiritual y obligas y lo firmé. Dn. Laureano Gómez Mojena.

STERLING A. STOUDEMIRE

The University of North Carolina

MAISTRE ANDRÉ, ITALIEN

Ever since Armand Baschet called attention in his book, *Les comédiens italiens à la cour de France* (1882, p. 4), to "Maistre André, italien," who was commanded by the governor of Paris "de faire et composer des farces et moralitez les plus exquisés" for a royal entry in 1530, it has been assumed that this charge was given to the leader of a company of traveling actors and that consequently the influence of the Italian on the French theater began at this early date. Sanesi, however (*La Commedia*, I, 433), suggested that the reference to Maistre André and to "Messire Mathée et ses compagnons" at the same time was possibly only to a group of artizans and merchants who gave amateur performances, not to stable companies of professional players.

The probabilities are, I think, against these guesses and in favor of identifying Maistre André with a Maestro Andrea in Rome in 1525, who was neither a professional nor an amateur actor, but a builder of pageants. The satirical witticism recorded of him in a Florentine document (from the *Archivio* of Florence, Carte Stroziane, under date, Feb. 11), which is quoted by A. Ademollo in *I teatri di Roma nel secolo decimosettimo* (1888, p. 3, n. 1), is described as follows:

Hieri Mo. Andrea dipintore fece un carro dove erano tutte le cortigiane vecchie di Roma fatte di carta, ciascuna con il nome suo et tutte le buttò in fiume avanti al Papa. . . . Domane le cortigiane per vendicarsi frustano detto Mo. Andrea per tutta Roma.

What more probable than that this bold satirist, driven from Rome, should seek a field for his talents in the north, far from his enemies?

WINIFRED SMITH

Vassar College

GOETHE'SCHE VERSE IN EINER WIELAND'SCHEN
DICHTUNG?

In einem Aufsatz mit obigem Titel vertritt Max Morris (Goethe-Studien, I, 133 ff.) die Ansicht, daß der Fischgesang in Wielands *Wintermärchen* nicht von Wieland, sondern von Goethe sei:

Der Pflicht vergessen
Wir Fische nie;
Haben viel Müh
Und karg zu essen,
Bau'n spät und früh
Uns luft'ge Schlösser,
Hättens gern besser
Statt immer schlimmer
Und rathen immer
Und treffen's nie.

Metrische oder andere objektive Gründe vermag Morris nicht anzuführen, er meint nur, hier sei "gar nicht Wieland's, aber ganz Goethe's Art." Er stützt seine Ansicht durch die Bemerkung daß Goethe schon in einem den 24. 12. 75 datirten Briefe an Karl August die zwei Verse

Der Pflicht vergessen
Wir Fische nie

zitiert, während das *Wintermärchen* erst 1776 (nämlich im Januar-Heft des *Merkurs*) veröffentlicht wurde.

Wieland hatte also den Beiden das *Wintermärchen* aus dem Manuskript vorgelesen und bei dieser Gelegenheit wird Goethe die Verse improvisirt haben. . . . In der Kunstgeschichte muß häufig über die Autorschaft aus inneren Gründen, aus dem Gesamteindruck geurtheilt werden. Warum soll ein solches Urtheil nicht auch in der Literaturgeschichte möglich sein? Goethe's geistige Handschrift ist wahrscheinlich nicht so schwer zu erkennen. Das Vorstehende beansprucht nicht die Frage zur Entscheidung zu bringen, sondern es soll die Anregung geben, daß Andere sich äussern, ob sie denselben Eindruck von unsern Versen erhalten.

Der oben nach Morris wiedergegebene Text entstammt der Ausgabe letzter Hand vom Jahre 1796 (C¹ 18. Bd. S. 231), während der ursprüngliche Text des *Merkurs* (1776, I, 64), der doch bei der Frage nach der Verfasserschaft allein in Betracht kommt, eine ganz andere Fassung aufweist:

Der Pflicht vergessen
 Wir Fische nie;
 Haben viele Müh,
 Sind spat und früh,
 Rechnen und messen,
 Essen und vergessen,
 Und bauen Schlösser
 Und mahlen sie;
 Hätten's gern besser!
 Zählen die Sterne;
 Und rathen gerne,
 Und treffens nie.

Die ursprünglichen zwölf Verse wurden in 1796 auf zehn zusammengezogen, wobei nur die beiden ersten, von Goethe zitierten Verse, sowie der Schlußvers unverändert blieben. Falls nun jemand geneigt wäre anzunehmen, Goethe habe die ursprünglichen Verse von 1775 gedichtet, und dann auch 1796 die Umarbeitung besorgt, die Morris ihm zuschreiben möchte, so ist zu bemerken, daß die Verse 1-6 schon im Jahre 1785 in der endgültigen Fassung vorliegen (*Auserlesene Gedichte*, 5. Bd. S. 59), während die vier Schlußverse der von Morris benutzten Redaktion hier durch fünf andere vertreten sind:

und mahlen sie;
 sind große messer
 von wann und wie;
 hätten's gern besser
 und kriegen's nie.

Soll Goethe auch hier mitgeholfen haben? Dann wäre auch die Möglichkeit seiner Mitarbeit an vielen andern Stellen in Betracht zu ziehen, denn gerade im *Wintermärchen* hat Wieland bei jeder Gelegenheit gefeilt und geändert, sogar in der Ausgabe des Jahres 1791 (*Auserlesene Gedichte* 5. Bd.), die sonst nur den Text von 1785 wiederholt.

Der Morris'schen Annahme fehlt jede Begründung: man braucht nur anzunehmen daß Wieland im Dezember 1775 einen Teil des fertigen Gedichts in Goethes Gegenwart vorgelesen habe, das Zitat in Goethes Brief erklärt sich dann ganz einfach als Reminiszenz.

W. KURRELMAYER

REVIEWS

La Légende Arthurienne. Première Partie: Les Plus Anciens Textes. By EDMOND FARAL. Paris: Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, 1929. Tomes 255, 257.

Three things M. Faral has essayed in these volumes. Two of them, as was to be expected, he has done brilliantly; the third, as was to be expected, is a failure.

A real contribution is his third volume in which he has brought together—not “les plus anciens textes,” since not a single Welsh text is included—but “les plus anciens textes latins”: the *Historia Britonum*, the *Annales Cambriae*, Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* and *Vita Merlini*. Welcome is the printing for the first time of the Chartres text of “Nennius,” as well as the Harleian text; welcome, too, is an edition of Geoffrey's *Historia* from a new MS., Cambridge, Trinity College, 1125, which it is now possible to compare with the three used by Mr. Griscom for his edition. To have in one volume these diplomatic texts of three Latin works so important for the history of Arthurian romance is a great boon.

Besides the texts M. Faral has given us a fresh and valuable discussion of the Latin material from Gildas to 1150. With indefatigable industry he has studied the original works and arrived at his own conclusions. Much of his space he devotes to historical and textual problems which have nothing to do with the Arthurian cycle, but which have great interest for the historian of the period of the Anglo-Saxon Conquest. Particularly valuable is his discussion of the relation of Geoffrey to the Latin authors known in his day; here M. Faral has gone far beyond his predecessors and has many an interesting suggestion to his credit. Of course, there is no question that Geoffrey was a learned man and took without scruple whatever he could fit into his scheme; the Breton book could have been only a partial source for the *Historia*. That has long been recognized. M. Faral effectively disposes of the claim that there is any reliable Celtic tradition in what Geoffrey has to say of the eagle of Sephton, of Bladud, of King Leir, and other deceptive tales. To the discussion of Latin texts and their non-Celtic relationships he has brought vast erudition and great acumen; and scholarship is thereby permanently enriched.

It is unfortunate that M. Faral has set before himself a third purpose, namely to demolish the theory that Arthurian romance is in large measure the heir of Celtic tradition, and to establish the thesis that it is mainly the fabrication of sophisticated literary men of the twelfth century. In order to do so he constantly ignores or warps the evidence, as I shall attempt to show. In “Nennius,”

though admitting that the story of the fatherless boy is obviously related to a story in the *Echtra Airt*, he merely demands, "Qui osera reconnaître avec assurance dans ce texte tiré d'un manuscrit du XVe siècle le témoin d'une tradition antérieure à la même *Historia Britonum*?"¹ In view of the fact that the *Echtra Airt* is mentioned in a list going back to the tenth century,² that the memory of the Celt is long, and that there is nothing to show the derivation of the Irish version from "Nennius," it is more dangerous to deny than to assert the Celticity of this episode. M. Faral weighs heavily on the argument that Arthur was a "chef breton du Nord,"³ and relies for his evidence on the localization of the twelve battles by Mr. Anscombe.⁴ But by his own admission many of the sites cannot be identified, and most of the rest could not have been fought over by the Saxons until many years after Arthur's death. The list tells us nothing that can be relied on of Arthur's historic activities. If, therefore, Bede, writing in the North two centuries after Arthur, says nothing of him, it does not follow that there was then no legend of Arthur current in Britain. Both his activities and his early fame may have been confined to the centre and the south. In fact, the two marvels connected with him in the *Historia Britonum* are admittedly derived from South Wales. Both have the appearance of genuine local traditions; one mentions the hunting of the "porcus Troynt," famous in *Kilhwch and Olwen*, and the other mentions Arthur's son Anir, also found in the *Mabinogion*. M. Faral declares that he would be an audacious person who would find in the allusion to the famous boar evidence of an already developed legend;⁵ perhaps; but he would be far more audacious who asserted the contrary. M. Faral seems to believe that by challenging his opponents to assert what is highly probable, but not proved, he has established his own very unlikely hypothesis.

The same method of defiance is employed on the significant reference in the *Annales Cambriae* (A. D. 954-5) to the battle of Camlann, "at which Arthur and Medraut fell together." "Rien ne permet de dire . . . ni qui était Medraut, ni quelles étaient ses relations avec Arthur."⁶ "Tout ce dont l'existence est certaine se réduit à cette obscure et sèche note annalistique." But will M. Faral assert that this is all that existed in 955, and that every other Welsh reference to Medraut is a posterior invention? The probabilities are all against it. The well-known visit of the monks of Laon to Bodmin is disposed of thus:⁷ Though the account purports to be that of the monks themselves, several remarks are obviously later interpolations and the name of the Archbishop of

¹ I, 118.

² *Eriu*, III (1907), 149. Cf. F. N. Robinson's article in *Kittredge Anniversary Papers* (Boston, 1913), p. 191.

³ I, 153.

⁴ Pp. 140-144.

⁵ P. 235.

⁶ P. 223.

⁷ Pp. 225-233.

Canterbury is mistaken. Therefore, "il est interdit de s'appuyer sur le texte d'Herman de Tournai." Is M. Faral ready to accept the consequences of this statement that a single error destroys the credibility of a document? Finally, after passing over William of Malmesbury's testimony in 1125 to the existence of "Britonum nugae," "fallaces fabulae" concerning Arthur,⁸ as a matter unworthy of commentary, he surveys the status of the Arthurian tradition in 1135, and solemnly states that it consisted, apart from the semi-historical contribution of "Nennius," of three meager scraps of local legend, of some wholly unromantic passages in the saints' lives, and of a belief that Arthur would return.⁹ To this one may reply that *a priori* the Celtic imagination would abhor such a vacuum; of all peoples the Celts would not leave a hero, whose memory had outlasted six hundred years, without an adequate legend. In the second place the legend, or enough of it, is actually preserved in *Kilhwch and Olwen*, the Black Book poem, and the *Preiddeu Annwfn*.¹⁰ Here is a body of material, probably antedating Geoffrey, certainly independent of Geoffrey; and yet in his survey of the Arthurian legend in 1135 M. Faral does not give us a hint of its existence. No more does he mention the evidence for the spread of the legend on the Continent, the Arthurian and Celtic affinities of the *Pèlerinage Charlemagne*,¹¹ the mention of Avalon in the *Couronnement Louis*,¹² the personal names in Italy,¹³ the Modena sculpture,¹⁴ the curiously consistent testimony regarding Bleheris.¹⁵ It is hard to take such a survey as M. Faral's seriously.

In the same spirit M. Faral comes to Geoffrey of Monmouth. Of course, much of the *Historia* is a late fabrication or a manipulation of books we still possess; M. Faral believes this to be substantially true of all. There was no Breton book and little other Celtic tradition.¹⁶ One may forgive him for trying to connect Estrildis with Estritha¹⁷ and forgetting all about Isolt or Essylt, whose story in certain points strikingly corresponds with that of Estrildis;¹⁸ one may forgive the omission of all references to the curious hints in

⁸ Cf. *Speculum*, II (1927), 449.

⁹ Pp. 257-261.

¹⁰ On *Black Book* poem cf. *Aberystwyth Studies*, VIII (1926), 54-7. On both cf. R. S. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance* (N. Y., 1927), 92, 105 f., 201.

¹¹ *MP*, xxv (1928), 331 ff. *Speculum*, III (1928), 24 f.

¹² *Speculum*, III, 24.

¹³ *Romania*, xvii (1888), 161 ff., 355 ff.

¹⁴ On date cf. *Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis* (N. Y., 1927), pp. 215-28; *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, ser. v, vol. xviii, pp. 15 ff. On the subject cf. *RR*, xv, 266 ff.

¹⁵ *Romania*, LIII (1927), 82 ff.

¹⁶ II, 400.

¹⁷ P. 96.

¹⁸ Tristram's visits to the *Salle aux Images* bear a marked resemblance to those of Locrinus to the subterranean chamber.

Arthurian romance that there existed Welsh stories of Belin and Bran quite independent of Geoffrey's Bellinus and Brennius,¹⁹ the failure to mention the birth of Mongan as a parallel to the birth of Arthur,²⁰ the failure to note the connections between Lucius Hiberus, and the Welsh Llwch and Irish Lug,²¹ the absence of any serious consideration of such significant name-forms as Morgan, Modredus, Hiderus, Eventus and Walwanus;²² the failure to mention, in connection with Morgan and her sisters, the nine princesses dwelling with their father in the Land beyond the Western Sea, or the nine sea-maidens in the depths between Ireland and Scotland,²³ and his failure to note other specific analogies between the Isle of Avalon and the Celtic Other World. But when it is gravely suggested that Geoffrey invented Urian, Merlin, and Morgan le Fay;²⁴ that the origin of the names Pridwen and Excalibur is unknown;²⁵ that Uther is a corruption of Petr;²⁶ but that Avalloc cannot be a corruption of Avallach or Aballach;²⁷ that nothing was known of Taliessin before Geoffrey's time except his name, and that his later fame is due to his prominence in the *Vita Merlini*;²⁸ then it is clear that M. Faral has neither given Celtic literature the attention which his thesis demands, nor has he the cool, scientific judgment to appraise its claims.

In sum, M. Faral in the rôle of Foerster *redivivus* has laid himself open to the following serious criticisms. His knowledge of Celtic literature is too limited to make his failure to see many

¹⁹ R. S. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, 197 f.

²⁰ *Transactions of Cymmrodorion Society*, 1912-13, pp. 72-80.

²¹ Loomis, *op. cit.*, 347 ff.

²² On Morgan cf. *ibid.*, 192 f. On Hiderus cf. p. 349. On Walwanus cf. p. 334 and *PMLA.*, XLIII, 395. On Modred, cf. *Romania*, xxv, 2. One would like to ask how, if Geoffrey knew only of Modred from the mention of Medraut in the *Annales Cambriae*, he came to hit upon precisely the Cornish form of the name. On Eventus cf. *ZfSL.*, XII, 233.

²³ S. H. O'Grady, *Silva Gadelica*, II, 238 ff. *Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis*, p. 275.

²⁴ II, 44, 275, 306. Urian, of course, was no invention of Geoffrey's but a historic king, and is celebrated in much old Welsh poetry, together with his son Owain. Cf. *Cymmrodor*, xxviii (1918), 193 f.; J. E. Lloyd, *Hist. of Wales*, I, 163-5.

²⁵ Pp. 265 f. The source of Pridwen can be found in Bruce, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, I, 43 (though Prydwen is there a ship and not a shield), and the source of Caliburnus has long been recognized in Welsh Caledwylch, Irish Caladbolg.

²⁶ P. 248. This despite the fact that a gloss in a 13th century MS. of Nennius says Arthur was called "Mab uter britannice" because he was a fierce youth, and that a *Death-Song of Uthyr* is preserved in Welsh that has not the remotest suggestion that it was inspired by Geoffrey. It seems clear, and is in fact generally agreed, that the Welsh saying that Arthur was a fierce youth, "mab uter," was easily misunderstood to mean that he was a son of that Uthyr, whose name was already familiar in poetry.

²⁷ P. 300.

²⁸ Pp. 376, 384.

Celtic elements in a given author of much significance; what he does not know he cannot recognize. His knowledge of the literature about his subject shows equal limitations: I find no reference to Fletcher's *Arthurian Material in the Chronicles*, Taylor's *Political Prophecy in England*, Morris Jones' *Taliessin*. He seems to believe that if a Welsh story of Arthur, Myrddin, or Taliessin occurs in MS. only after 1150, no matter how unlike anything of Geoffrey's, Geoffrey was the inspirer of that story; that it did not exist before him, and would not have existed but for him. His attempts to minimize the testimony to oral traditions concerning Arthur before Geoffrey are ineffectual. His mind, quick to detect the debt of one book to another, seems unable to perceive the more subtle relationships of folklore or even the signs of oral transmission. He gives no consideration worth mentioning to name-forms, which reveal rather more surely than any other kind of evidence the fortunes of the stories in which they are embedded. It is to be hoped for the sake of scholarship and his own high reputation that M. Faral will realize these grave limitations, and that, when he continues his work, it will reveal a real knowledge of Celtic literature and an understanding of how it would be affected by a long period of oral transmission.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS

Columbia University

RÉPONSE

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Directeur, de m'avoir communiqué le texte de l'article consacré par M. Roger Sherman Loomis aux trois premiers volumes de mes études sur la *Légende arthurienne*. Si cet article ne me paraissait regrettable que par le ton et la témérité des affirmations, je n'y répondrais pas. Mais il est de nature à donner aux lecteurs une idée tout à fait fausse de mon travail, et c'est ce que je ne puis laisser passer sans protestation. Que M. Loomis me taxe, pour commencer, de prévention ou d'incompétence à l'égard des choses celtiques, et qu'il déclare que, sur ce point, mon échec était prévu ("as was to be expected"); qu'il me prête, ensuite, comme à un sot, l'imbécile opinion qu'il suffit de détruire la thèse d'autrui pour établir la sienne propre: ce sont des injures gratuites. Mais, quand M. Loomis écrit que j'ai récusé le témoignage d'Herman de Tournai pour la seule raison qu'il contenait une erreur (alors que j'ai relevé dans ce témoignage plusieurs éléments tardifs, dont personne ne saurait décider si ce sont de simples interpolations ou des vices inhérents à l'original); quand il écrit que j'ai passé sur le texte de Guillaume de Malmesbury daté de 1125 comme sur une matière indigne de commentaire (alors que j'ai consacré plusieurs pages à ce sujet): il fausse les faits d'une manière que je ne puis tolérer.

Je ne puis tolérer, surtout, certaines accusations d'ignorance qui sont de pures calomnies. M. Loomis, qui n'a pas trouvé dans mon livre la mention de trois critiques dont il cite les noms, ose déclarer formellement que mon information bibliographique est déficiente. Que mon information ait ses limites, il se peut; et je remercierai qui me le montrera. Mais je n'admets pas que M. Loomis accuse sans preuve. M. Loomis (qui, lui, cite plus volontiers les critiques que les sources) aurait dû s'apercevoir que, en dégagant volontairement du fatras bibliographique, j'ai évité de citer sans utilité les ouvrages dits "critiques" auxquels je n'avais pas de dette ou dont je n'ai pas jugé à propos de discuter les thèses. Il n'avait pas à s'étonner de ne trouver ici les noms ni de Fletcher, ni de Taylor, ni de Morris Jones: et il en a conclu, pourtant, que je les ignorais. Mais, à ce compte, et en raisonnant comme lui, que faudrait-il penser de sa propre information? Ce n'est pas de trois noms qu'il aurait dû constater l'absence: c'est de plus de cent. Ces cent noms connus, va-t-il donc falloir considérer qu'il ne les connaît pas?

Il y a pis, et c'est ici que j'élève la protestation la plus énergique. M. Loomis déclare que j'ai ignoré ou méconnu certains textes ou documents relatifs aux choses celtiques et prend argument de ce qu'il n'en a pas trouvé mention dans cette première série d'études. N'a-t-il donc pas lu ma préface? N'a-t-il pas compris (c'est pourtant notre métier de comprendre les livres) que ma méthode a été, évitant toute systématisation, de prendre les monuments un à un, dans l'ordre où les présentait la chronologie, et de les examiner selon cet ordre?¹ Le tour de chacun d'eux viendra. Il viendra au moment voulu. Et quand il viendra, je saurai dire pourquoi il n'est venu qu'à ce moment-là. Si M. Loomis s'était borné à exprimer son étonnement de ne pas trouver déjà dans ces premières études les textes qu'il attendait, si même il avait exprimé le doute que je puisse, plus tard, justifier mon opinion relativement à la date des documents qu'il considère, lui, comme anciens, il n'eût usé que de son droit. Mais, avant de condamner pour ignorance, son devoir élémentaire était d'attendre et d'entendre. Rien ne l'autorisait à me reprocher, comme il l'a fait, une insuffisante considération pour la littérature celtique et une insuffisante information dans ce domaine. Mes propres publications, s'il les connaissait mieux, et le livre même qu'il critique, s'il l'avait mieux lu, lui auraient fourni du contraire quelques indices dont je lui fais grâce.

Les procédés de discussion que je viens de relever sont tellement inusités parmi les historiens qu'ils me dispensent de relever une à une les assertions de M. Loomis; qu'il me suffise de dire que je n'en admets aucune.

EDMOND FARAL

Collège de France

¹ J'ai manqué à cette règle en parlant primitivement, pour la commodité

REBUTTAL

I regret deeply that the tone of my review offends M. Faral. At the same time, I cannot but appeal to the readers of this journal to judge whose controversial style is the more offensive. To their learned suffrages also I am content to leave the decision whether my strictures are baseless slanders or sound criticisms.

Unlike M. Faral, I admit one error. He did discuss the *nugae Britonum* mentioned by William of Malmesbury. The only excuse I can offer for my mistaken impression is that the major part of the discussion was concerned with other passages, that the crucial word *Britonum* was neglected, and that no note was taken of Prof. Brown's plausible interpretation of the passage (*Speculum*, II, 449). As to the testimony of Herman de Tournai, I should willingly admit myself in the wrong if M. Faral had proved that these particular interpolations threw real doubt upon the narrative. Since only one interpolation does so, I regard my statement of the case as accurate. Indeed, M. Faral himself, who on pp. 230-2 is the complete skeptic, on pp. 258, 260 accepts the narrative just as I do, except that he makes a reservation regarding the date.

When he declares, "Rien ne l'autorisait à me reprocher une insuffisante considération pour la littérature celtique et une insuffisante information dans ce domaine," I can only refer the impartial reader to my list of the numerous Celtic matters which M. Faral has overlooked or slighted in dealing with Geoffrey of Monmouth. He entirely misinterprets me when he says that my charge is based on his failure to treat certain old Welsh texts. I have never thought or said that he did not know these texts and the other evidence commonly supposed to antedate Geoffrey. What I have said is, that he gave no hint of the existence of this material when he formally reviewed the evidence as to the status of the Arthurian legend in 1135. I do not question his right to upset the dates which other scholars have attached to these documents, if he can. What I do question is his right to pronounce a conclusion on this fundamental issue before he has considered the major part of the evidence against him.

What of the evidence he did consider? On pp. 223, 235, 251, he appraises the testimony of the *Annales Cambriae*, the *Mirabilia*, and William of Malmesbury, and though he does nothing to shake the probability that the references to the battle of Camlann and the "porcus Troynt" implied the existence of elaborate tales connected with Arthur, he denies the right to assert the existence of such tales on this evidence alone. So far, so good. But on p. 260, summing up his case, he asserts that they did not exist. Outside the Latin texts, he says, there existed nothing but a "tradition dispersée, flottante,

de l'exposé, de la *Vie de S. Goeston* et de quelques textes relatifs à Glastonbury; voilà sur quoi la critique aurait légitimement porté.

sans corps littéraire, du type des légendes topographiques . . . avec toutefois cette idée répandue . . . qu'Arthur n'était point mort." My characterization of this reasoning as establishing his own hypothesis by challenging his opponents to assert what is highly probable but not proved, still seems to me accurate. Whereas his version of my charge—"il suffit de détruire la thèse d'autrui pour établir la sienne propre"—seems to fit neither what I said nor what he has done; he has not destroyed the probability that tales like *Kilhwch* were told in the tenth century.

His argument that any reviewer who makes the charge of an inadequate bibliography cannot be consistent unless he supplies all the missing titles, needs no commentary; neither does his vindication of the right to ignore Fletcher and Morris Jones. If I have been mistaken in attributing to ignorance the failure to mention these works of first importance, I offer my apologies. But the gaps remain, and other scholars will draw the same natural inference. I am far from alone in my estimate of M. Faral's work. Arthurian specialists, we all have our defects in equipment and method. I have mine. And M. Faral, despite his brilliance and his assumption of an unparalleled scientific precision, is not exempt from some of the gravest.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS

The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth with contributions to the study of its place in early British history. By ACTON GRISCOM, M. A., together with a literal translation of the Welsh manuscript No. LXI of Jesus College, Oxford, by ROBERT ELLIS JONES, S. T. D. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1929. Pp. xii + 672.

Mr. Griscom lists 185 MSS. of Geoffrey's *Historia* in 49 different libraries, and prudently remarks that in all probability others exist. Indeed, as a friend pointed out to me, a book that Mr. Griscom knows well, J. G. Evans, *Report on MSS. in the Welsh Language*, II, 2 (1903), on page 781, mentions another MS., "Llanstephan 196, vellum; $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches; 176 pages; XVth century," and supplies a more recent description (p. 768) of "Llanstephan 176," which Mr. Griscom (p. 562), following Hardy (1862), calls "Phillipps 9162."

The only available text of the *Historia* has been that printed by San Marte in 1854, which was a reprint of Giles's text of 1844. Giles's text is called a critical edition based upon nine MSS., but it is suspected that it chiefly followed the edition of Commelin, of 1587. To Commelin is due the present division into twelve books.

Commelin largely followed the text of Bade, 1508, which was based, the editor said, upon four MSS. and corrected by himself. The MSS. that were used have not been identified.

Under these circumstances it is a boon to scholars to print any one of the better MSS. Mr. Griscom prints Camb. 1706, and gives variants from Bern 568, and Lord Harlech 17. Two of these MSS. are well chosen. For the selection of Lord Harlech's MS. no good reason exists.

So far as I can judge, the important part of the work, to wit, the faithful transcription of the manuscript, Cambridge 1706, has been accurately done. I have compared the printed Latin text with two facsimile plates (one is the frontispiece, and the other faces page 52), and have also checked two other pages against rotographs of the manuscript, and find no errors of any kind. Mr. Griscom's edition is the one¹ which will be used by scholars who are investigating the origins of Arthurian romance, because it is as accurate as a rotograph and of course more convenient and handy than a rotograph could possibly be.

Griscom's introduction is devoted to proving two points, first that ancient Welsh traditions were reproduced by Geoffrey, a point that has some truth in it; and second that traces of these lost Welsh sources which were used by Geoffrey, are present in the Welsh *Bruts*. Since these Welsh *Bruts* are all admittedly influenced by Geoffrey proof is nearly impossible. Griscom's arguments for this second point have been well answered by Faral.²

Mr. Griscom lists 58 MSS. of these Welsh *Bruts*, and prints on the same page with the Latin *Historia* a new and literal translation made by Canon Jones from one of these MSS. The service to scholarship would have been greater if Mr. Griscom, instead of asking Canon Jones to translate a MS. of the late fifteenth century, Jesus College, Oxford, LXI, a manuscript which had been translated into English before, had chosen to reproduce for us one of the more ancient and inaccessible Welsh MSS.

The significant thing, however, is that Mr. Griscom has given us an accurate reproduction of two good MSS. of the Latin *Historia*. It may be that, since a critical text based upon all the MSS. would be a colossal task, this edition will serve the needs of scholarship. What might be done, perhaps, would be to compile an onomasticon of proper names giving the readings of all the MSS. Such an onomasticon is needed for Arthurian research.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN

Northwestern University

¹ Another edition, Faral, *La Légende Arthurienne*, vol. III, Paris, 1929, has recently appeared, which, because the text has been normalized, is more readable than Griscom's.

² *Romania*, LV (1929), 521-527.

Briefe von und an August Wilhelm Schlegel. Gesammelt und erläutert durch JOSEF KÖRNER. 2 Bde. Zürich, Leipzig, Wien: Amalthea Verlag, 1930. Pp. xi, 652; xv, 450. Geh. M. 40, Geb. M. 56.

Ludwig Tieck und die Brüder Schlegel. Briefe mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von H. LÜDEKE. Frankfurt a.M.: Joseph Baer u. Co., 1930. Pp. 252. Geh. M. 7.

"Seines Fleisses darf sich jedermann rühmen," wrote Lessing in 1768. And Josef Körner, looking back upon years of patient, exacting labor, may well be proud of his exemplary industry and of the latest fruits thereof, the eleven-hundred-page work, *Briefe von und an August Wilhelm Schlegel*. Here he has at last made accessible to scholars and general readers everywhere the second of the three great sources from which much of our knowledge of German literature between 1785 and 1845 springs—the A. W. Schlegel-Nachlass. The first and foremost source, the Goethe-Nachlass, has long been an open book; the third, the multifarious Varnhagen von Ense collection, still remains to be completely brought to light.

The importance of A. W. Schlegel as a figure in the great republic of letters need hardly be stressed in this place. His significance as a friend and collaborator of Goethe, Schiller and Tieck, as a leader of German Romanticism, as a scholar and littérateur, as a critic, publicist and patriot, is generally known, despite Heinrich Heine. Nor need it be emphasized that outside of Germany, in France and England particularly, he is still looked upon as one of Germany's most representative men of letters.

Körner's collection of about 450 letters, most of them from the Nachlass in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek, but some from a variety of scattered sources, is particularly valuable because it tills virgin soul throughout. The editor, for reasons of space if on no other grounds, had to refrain from publishing anything which was already available. On the other hand, he felt compelled to discard countless unedited letters of minor importance. But insofar as these contain information of value, they have been incorporated in the second volume, which, besides a bibliography, a table of all previously published letters to and from August Wilhelm, and an index, contains some three hundred pages of notes.

It would be impossible, in the scope of a review such as this, to give a conspectus of all the new data presented by these letters. But the reader may be assured that a perusal of this work will leave him with a remarkably clear impression of the elder Schlegel, his complex interests and activities, and his wide circle, not of friends but of acquaintances. We can here select as an illustration

but a single incident in Schlegel's life—his monumental translation of Shakespeare. Although a rich literature has grown up around this subject, we have not been able to get an absolutely complete, accurate picture of this important undertaking, and of its vicissitudes, until now. The correspondence of Schlegel and the publisher Reimer clearly shows a certain unbending arrogance and unfairness on Schlegel's part, a bungling dilatoriness but at the same time an honest spirit of coöperation on Tieck's part, and an admirable indulgence on Reimer's part. Had it not been for Tieck's live interest and Reimer's patience, the translation would never have been completed; indeed, Schlegel himself would not have done as much with it as he did.

The letters are arranged in chronological order, beginning with 1786 and ending with 1845. They fall quite naturally into three periods, which the editor characterizes by the titles "*Kosmopolit der Kunst und Poesie*," "*Weltfahrer und Patriot*," and "*Der deutsche Professor*." In the first section, extending as far as March, 1804, the names of C. J. Heyne, G. J. Göschen, C. G. Schütz, C. A. Böttiger, J. F. Reichardt, Fouqué, and J. D. Gries figure prominently. The second section takes us as far as May, 1818, and adds such names as Helmina von Chézy, the younger Heinrich Voss, Carl von Hardenberg, and Friedrich Wilken. The last section reveals Schlegel corresponding with Baron von Altenstein, the Paulus family, K. J. Windischmann, Sulpiz Boisserée, Jacob Grimm and many others more or less prominent.

There are twelve first-rate illustrations, the most notable being a newly discovered portrait (1820) by the Rhenish painter H. C. Kolbe, and a forgotten bust (1816) by Friedrich Tieck.

It is the reviewer's sincere hope that this most recent monument which Josef Körner has erected to his own scholarship and for the glory of the whole scholarly world, will be accorded that reception which it deserves.

The letters exchanged by Tieck and the Schlegels—August Wilhelm, Friedrich and Dorothea—are published separately by Henry Lüdeke. This undertaking, not nearly as important as that of Körner, is none the less of considerable significance from the literary historian's point of view. For the first time we have here, in compact form and between two covers, all the relevant letters so far as they have been preserved in any form. They are 108 in number. Of these, 39 are from August Wilhelm to Tieck (the earliest Dec. 11, 1797), 34 from Tieck to August Wilhelm (the earliest Dec., 1797), 16 from Friedrich to Tieck (the earliest Nov., 1797), 9 from Tieck to Friedrich (the earliest Mar., 1801), 4 from Dorothea to Tieck (the earliest Dec. 17, 1801), 2 from Tieck to Dorothea (the earlier one Feb. 23, 1829), 3 from Tieck to his sister and August Wilhelm jointly (the earliest Sept., 1802), and one of August 27, 1836, from August Wilhelm to Countess Pinkenstein.

But by no means are all these letters published here for the first time. According to my count, 61 were published before and 47 are new. Of the 61 old letters, 54 are found in Holtei. Of these, 13 had to be copied from Holtei because the originals are lost. The originals of the other 43 Holtei documents were accessible to Lüdeke and are published in accurate transcripts for the first time.

Some of this information, which I have verified, can be gathered from Lüdeke's preface and notes. But the editor says nothing about 7 other letters which, though he publishes them from original manuscripts, had previously appeared in other places. They are Nos. 5 and 16, published by J. Fränkel in *Aus der Blütezeit der Romantik* (the former also in *Vossische Zeitung*, Beilage 45, 1907); No. 48 by G. Klee in *Program-Bautzen*, 1895; Nos. 78, 88, and 90 by Finke, *Briefe an Friedrich Schlegel*; and No. 86 by Krebs in *P. O. Runge's Entwicklung unter dem Einfluss Ludwig Tiecks*.¹

The editor calls attention, on p. 10, to the present reviewer's article in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* of January, 1928, but not to his supplementary remarks in the same journal of July, 1928. Nor does he seem to take sufficiently into account that these articles restrict themselves to the earliest relations of Tieck and the Schlegels, which are admittedly not marked by any sincere friendship between Tieck and Friedrich. Such friendship was to follow later.

Apart from the undoubted fact that we get a much clearer picture of the Schlegel-Tieck relations through the availability of the letters in a single volume, where formerly we had to consult half a dozen works, the principal one of which, Holtei's, is notoriously unreliable, much fresh light is shed by the new letters, especially upon the contacts of August Wilhelm and Tieck. We are not so fortunate with regard to Friedrich, whose correspondence with Tieck has for the most part been destroyed.

Lüdeke's twelve-page introduction and his notes, which observe the style perfected by Körner in his voluminous collections, are adequate. There can be no doubt but that the editor, with his painstaking philological accuracy, has contributed a standard work, which no library interested in German Romanticism and no student of German literature could well afford to miss.

The work appears as No. 13 in the Ottendorfer Memorial Fellowship Series of New York University.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

University of Cincinnati

¹ Cf. also the fragments published by Waitz in *Caroline und ihre Freunde*, Leipzig, 1882.

Sachwörterbuch der Deutschkunde. Unter Förderung durch die Deutsche Akademie herausgegeben von Dr. WALTHER HOFSTAETTER und Prof. Dr. ULRICH PETERS. B. II: K-Z. Leipzig u. Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1930. viii u. 683 pp. Index 44 pp. Mk. 34.

Der zweite Band des Sachwörterbuchs interessiert in erster Linie durch das nunmehr vorliegende Namen- und Sachwörterverzeichnis, das durch ein praktisches System sowohl das Aufschlagen der ganzen Artikel wie der darin enthaltenen Einzelheiten erleichtert und auf diese Weise die Brauchbarkeit des Werkes erst eigentlich erweist.

Von der Reichhaltigkeit des Wörterbuches, die schon in der Besprechung des ersten Bandes (*MLN.*, XLV, 481) hervorgehoben wurde, geben Stichproben ein gutes Bild, z. B. *Katholizismus* mit den Unterabteilungen Idee, Gehalt, Gestalt, Weltanschauung und Lebensauffassung, Autorität und Freiheit; *Mittelalter* (20 Spalten); *Musik* (20 Spalten); *Nachkriegszeit* (12 Spalten); *Religion* (22 Spalten). Aber auch kürzere Artikel wie diejenigen über *Vers* oder verwandte metrische Themen zeigen eine glückliche Konzentration des Notwendigen mit der Berücksichtigung auch der jüngsten Theorien.

Dagegen bricht die Information betreffs Übersetzungsliteratur etwas plötzlich mit Bodenstedt, Heyse, Simrock und Hertz ab. Was der Impressionismus auf diesem Gebiete gezeitigt hat, verdiente mehr als flüchtige Erwähnung. Wenn auch bei den französischen Symbolisten wenigstens im Artikel *Frankreich* darauf verwiesen ist (Rilke), so ist wiederum (vergl. die oben angeführte Besprechung des ersten Bandes) die Übersetzung aus dem Englischen zu kurz gekommen. Der Name Whitman ist im ganzen Werke nicht genannt.

Es sei aber auch noch einmal betont, daß der Germanist hierzulande nicht ohne dieses reichhaltige und schöne Werk rechter Hand von seinem Schreibtische wird auskommen können.

ERNST FEISE

Deutsche Literatur. Reihe Barock: Barockdrama, Band 1. Das schlesische Kunstdrama. Herausgegeben von Univ.-Prof. Dr. WILLI FLEMMING, Leipzig, 1930. Verlag von Philipp Reclam jun. 332 Seiten. Geheftet 7 Mk., Ganzleinen 9 Mk., Halbleder 15 Mk.

This represents the first of five volumes which shall cover in the new series, *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen*, the German drama of the seventeenth century (period of the Barocco). Vol. 2

is to give a picture of *Das Ordensdrama*; Vol. 3, *Wanderbühne und volkstümliches Drama*; Vol. 4, *Die Komödie*; Vol. 5, *Oper, Sing- und Festspiele*. All five volumes are to be edited by the well-known specialist in the field, Professor Willi Flemming, Rostock.

Following an introduction of 54 pages by the editor, this first volume brings first a few significant passages on the theory of tragedy, selected from the works of Scaliger, Heinsius and Opitz, then fairly copious selections from the 1625 translation of Seneca's *Trojan Women* by Opitz. The body of the work consists of three representative tragedies, two by Andreas Gryphius: *Cardenio und Celinde* and *Aemilius Paulus Papinianus*, and one by Lohenstein: *Sophonisbe*. A few pages of notes (322-331) conclude the volume.

As was to be expected the *Introduction* is admirable. In concise form, almost too concise, it gives a full and vivid picture of the social conditions in which these dramatists lived and worked, the influences which affected them, both literary and technical, and their ideals in art and in life. Certain statements seem perhaps questionable or somewhat over emphasized, but on the whole I do not hesitate to declare it the best presentation of seventeenth century German tragedy which we have. The greater the pity then that the type is so small and the printed page so over-crowded. I also greatly regret the omission of even a brief bibliography.

The dramas selected are also excellent, though the prominence given to *Cardenio und Celinde* is a little surprising. It is, to be sure, the most modern of all seventeenth century dramas, but it does not, as Gryphius himself was the first to admit, possess the technical requisites of a tragedy on which the seventeenth century placed so great stress. In fact, though entitled *Trauer-Spiel*, it is no tragedy, rather *ein bürgerliches Schauspiel*. Nevertheless, I should have been sorry had it not been included. It was perhaps not necessary to reprint the introductions of the original authors (only in the case of the *Cardenio* is a portion given) but especially in the case of Lohenstein's *Sophonisbe*, with its large number of characters and complicated action, a brief introduction by the editor would have been decidedly helpful.

Of the notes I can only speak with regret. The constant repetition in so brief space (less than ten pages) puzzled me, until I turned to the annotated editions of Palm in the Stuttgart *Litterarischer Verein* and in Kürschner's *National Litteratur*. Flemming characterizes these (p. 36, notes): "zumal in den Lesarten unvollständig und unzuverlässig; die Angaben von Palm (on Gryphius' life) sind gänzlich überholt." And yet without, so far as I could discover, a word of acknowledgment, the notes to *Cardenio* and to *Papinianus* are taken almost verbatim from Palm. To be exact, of the 48 explanatory notes to *Cardenio* 43 come directly from the editions of Palm and of the 70 notes to *Papinianus* 60 from the same source. And not always even correctly transferred:

p. 323, Cardenio 2. Akt, 68, insert *des* after Gemahlin (*Vide* Palm, *Andreas Gryphius Trauerspiele*, p. 291, note 2).

The misprints are rather numerous. In addition to those mentioned in the brief review *AfdAuDL*, XLIX, p. 159, I noted the following: p. 20, 2d line of 3d paragraph, for *Bildungsweise* read *Bildungsreise*; p. 50, end of 1st paragraph, for *brauendes* read *brausendes* (?); p. 100, l. 178, for *Abgrung* read *Abgrund*; p. 102, l. 246, for *und* read *nun* (*Vide* Palm, *Trauerspiele*, 299, note 1 and the, for me at least unintelligible, reference, p. 328, *Sophonisbe*, 2. Akt, 40); p. 108, l. 153, wrong placing of apostrophe; p. 247, l. 95 f., either misprint or note necessary—does *bist* = *bittest*?); p. 260, l. 511, *Alpheus* with *ph*, but *Anmerkungen*, p. 329, with *f*. The line reference in the *Anmerkungen* are occasionally not exact, errors of but one line I omit, but p. 325, 2. Akt, for 243 read 253. Also p. 325, 3. Akt, 81, I fear the reference to the *Insel Zocotera* would be sought in vain. The spelling is taken from Gryphius' own note, it should read *Sokotra*. P. 326, 4. Akt, 182, for *trügt* read *trägt*; p. 329, 3. Akt, 437, for *sagt* read *tagt*; p. 330, 5. Akt, 10 and 27, punctuation lacking in both notes; p. 331, 248, for *Acidens* read *Alcidens*.

M. BLAKEMORE EVANS

Ohio State University

Sidney's Arcadia. A Comparison Between the Two Versions. By R. W. ZANDVOORT. Amsterdam: N. V. Swets & Zeitlinger, 1929. Pp. xiv + 316.

When in 1907 the late Bertram Dobell discovered several manuscript copies of an earlier form of Sidney's *Arcadia*, he raised a problem that highly needed to be solved—I mean the problem of the relation between the two forms with its inevitable corollaries: what are the respective merits of the two versions and what were Sidney's intentions in rewriting his romance? An answer to these questions is now offered by Dr. R. W. Zandvoort. Dr. Z. was already favorably known as co-editor of *English Studies*, an excellent little Dutch periodical of English philology and literature. But this, his first important venture in the field of scholarship, certainly places him at once among those who are destined to contribute valuable additions to our knowledge of Elizabethan literature.

The subtitle accurately defines the purport of the book: it is primarily a comparison between the two versions of *Arcadia*. It begins with a minute description of the MSS. and of the printed editions of 1590 and 1593. The characteristics of the different texts are brought out and the arbitrary modifications made by the

Countess of Pembroke set in their true light. In Chapter II Dr. Z. examines the two forms with a view to settling the already vexed question of their respective literary values. After a careful comparison the author comes to the conclusion that the later version shows a clear advance in characterization, in verisimilitude, and in narrative technique. I do not see how the force of the proofs here adduced can be resisted, and this chapter, compact and well-balanced, is probably the best in the book.

The third chapter, on the contrary, "Sidney's Progress as a Thinker," is a little disappointing. Irritated by Prof. Brie's narrow systematizations in the otherwise learned book, *Sidneys Arcadia*,¹ Dr. Z. engages in a refutation of the theory developed in that book, according to which Sidney in *Arcadia* wrote a political and personal allegory. And carried away by the controversial spirit (always a bad guide!) he is led to minimize the political significance of the second form. He thus misses the essential point of the comparison he is making. In the space allotted to me here I cannot present the case with full details; but, put in brief, what essentially distinguished the later form from the earlier one is this. The "old Arcadia," as described by Sidney himself was "but a trifle . . . triflingly handled," a story of love and adventures, in the manner of the Greek romances, written (in a somewhat humorous vein) for the amusement of his sister and of a group of ladies. This trifle, however, because the young author could not help being the most earnest of the Elizabethans, was sprinkled over with many a touch of wisdom and learning. And as he was writing the last "act" of his romance Sidney had already realised the value which these serious passages imparted to the story. So he began rewriting his manuscript with the evident desire to develop and emphasize that more weighty part of the romance. And so important were the additions thus made that the very signification of the book was totally changed. The "toyful book" was turned into one of those ambitious undertakings, characteristic of the spirit of the Renaissance, into which the author infused the wide knowledge he had of state affairs and more generally of life. Sidney meant no less than to write a book in which would be exemplified the rules of conduct necessary to be known by anyone who was destined to take a part in the government of men. The story was preserved, but from being the principal thing it became only a peg on which to hang the precepts which the author wanted to inculcate. In other words Sidney was realizing in prose his idea of the "heroical" poem as defined in his *Defence of Poesie*: he wanted with "the lofty image of . . .

¹ The great weakness of Prof. Brie's book is rather that it professes to be based on a comparison of the two versions, whilst it is evident that the author had at his disposal only the very insufficient article by Dobell and S. L. Wolff's analysis of the "Old Arcadia" in *Greek Romances*.

worthies" to inflame "the mind with desire to be worthy and inform with counsel how to be worthy." His ambition was to write a modern *Cyropaedia*, than which he saw no model better able "readily to direct a prince." In this radical transformation of the purpose, and, consequently, of the character of the book, lies the chief interest of a comparison between the two versions. It shows that Sidney did not mean to write an allegory proper. But as he delineated the princes and governors in the plot he certainly thought of the rulers he had met in the European courts. Whether this process, used by all fiction writers, should be called allegory or not is a matter of definition.

The last chapters rise to the same level of excellence as the first two. Dr. Z. has ably shown the considerable differences in the stylistic methods of the two forms. And summing up the sources used by Sidney in *Arcadia*, he gives a valuable analysis of the contents of a dissertation in manuscript by William Vaughn Moody. All things considered, this is a remarkable contribution to a difficult subject, and one which will prove indispensable to whoever wishes, in the future, to study the development of Sir Philip Sidney's mind.

ALBERT FEULLERAT

Yale University

Shakespeare's Haunts Near Stratford. By EDGAR I. FRIPP. Oxford University Press, 1929. Pp. viii + 160. 5s.

The little book before us is with *Master Richard Quynne* (1924) and *Shakespeare's Stratford* (1928) the third of a series of contributions by Mr. Fripp to a reconstruction of the Warwick background of Shakespeare. Shottery, Clopton, Snitterfield and other towns in close proximity to Stratford with which the poet must have been familiar, Shakespeare's relatives and their neighbors and the Cloptons, Lucys and other influential families of Warwickshire, whom Shakespeare doubtless knew, form the principal topics of the book. Under Mr. Fripp's guidance we are able to enter into the life of sixteenth and seventeenth century Warwickshire, with its religious quarrels, its new and oppressive landlords, its sports and its visiting players. Especially interesting is the author's argument that Shakespeare's marriage was free from any irregularity (pp. 15-24). Additional reasons, too, are presented for believing that the Geneva Bible was the version with which the dramatist was familiar (p. 86, n. 1), and that no ill-will existed between Shakespeare and Sir Thomas Lucy (pp. 82-86, 113, 119-20).

Mr. Fripp's argument (developed more fully in the two earlier works of the series) that Shakespeare spent his early youth as a lawyer's clerk (pp. 4, 6, 9, 54, 136) will probably not meet with

wide acceptance. The general question has, of course, been argued so often elsewhere that it need not concern us here. Mr. Fripp, however, must show, before his arguments based upon Shakespeare's use of a legal vocabulary can be admitted, that these terms could not have been acquired in that litigious age by a layman, especially if he were the intelligent son of a public official who was himself fond of going to law.

The index of the book is very good. The thirty-one illustrations (including sixteen excellent photographs by the author's son, Paul Fripp) are interesting and valuable. The work, though it contains no startling discoveries, by its careful assembling of facts pertaining to his background helps to bring the man William Shakespeare a little closer to us.

EDWIN E. WILLOUGHBY

The Newbury Library, Chicago

Shakspeare and "Sir Thomas Moore." By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM. New York: The Tenny Press; London: T. Werner Laurie, Ltd., 1929. Pp. 64.

In 1916, Sir Edward Maunde Thompson published his *Shakespeare's Handwriting*, concluding that three pages (folios 8a, 8b, 9a) of the MS. of the play of *Sir Thomas Moore* (Brit. Mus. Harl. 7368) are in the handwriting of Shakespeare. Sir Edward's study was followed by a veritable flood of notes, articles, and books. Of this literature a considerable portion may be dismissed as the work of mere freaks wasting paper upon fantastic theories. Scholars of competence have, however, busied themselves in the fray; and their arguments cannot be ignored or lightly dismissed. There are, it appears, at present, two principal schools of belief. One, led by Dr. Greg and Dr. Dover Wilson, advocates the theory that Shakespeare had a hand in *Sir Thomas Moore* and that the debated Three Pages are in his autograph. The other, led by Dr. Tannenbaum and Professor Kellner, as stoutly opposes these views. And a third and larger class, in which seems to be numbered Sir E. K. Chambers, might be formed from those whose verdict, for one reason or another, is "Not proven."

As time has passed, some clarification of the problem concerning authorship of the play has come about, chiefly through the labors of Dr. Greg, Professor Oliphant, and Dr. Tannenbaum. It appears to be the consensus of scholars that the MS. of *Sir Thomas Moore* presents the work of six different authors as collaborators or revisers or both. It is generally agreed that two of these dramatists are Anthony Mundy—principal author—and Thomas Dekker. A third co-author, Dr. Tannenbaum identifies positively as Thomas

Heywood. Upon bibliotic grounds, Dr. Tannenbaum assigns two other portions of *Sir Thomas Moore* to Henry Chettle and to Thomas Kyd, as authors respectively. He believes further that Kyd in the capacity of "playhouse reviser" for Lord Strange's Men copied portions of *Moore* which he did not compose and made some effort to whip the disorderly script into shape for its presentation. Dr. Tannenbaum refuses, however, to assign the Three Pages to Shakespeare.

In his preface to the present work Dr. Tannenbaum defines its purpose. He proposes to

show, among other things, that (1) the "bibliographic method" in the study of some of the . . . problems has been applied without proper regard to facts or to reason; (2) the conclusions reached by the English bibliographers are untenable; (3) properly applied, the bibliographic tests prove that Shakespeare did *not* write the revised insurrection scene; (4) Tom Heywood *was* one of the authors and revisers of the play; (5) not a single fact has yet been produced to invalidate . . . [his] identification of Thomas Kyd as copyist and author (and book-keeper) of part of *Sir Thomas Moore*; (6) . . . [his] former identification of Philip Massinger as the author and writer of a scene in the manuscript of *The Faithful Friends* is correct; and (7) the bibliotic method, applied to literary problems, yields results which are not only reliable but of great value.

Shakspere and "Sir Thomas Moore" is divided into twenty-two (misprinted twelve) sections. Dr. Tannenbaum first discusses Sir Edward Maunde Thompson's arguments for the attribution of the Three Pages to Shakespeare and points out the subsequent weakening of Sir Edward's case as admitted even by Dr. Greg. Then Dr. Greg's reviews, in *The London Times Literary Supplement* for November 24 and December 1, 1927, and in *The Library*, for September, 1928, of Dr. Tannenbaum's "*The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*" and his *Studies in Shakespeare's Penmanship* come in for consideration. Dr. Tannenbaum replies to the objections urged by Dr. Greg. Among the points treated are the word "seriant" (pp. 18-19, 23-24, 26); Dr. Greg's arguments based upon inks, blotting paper, and sand (pp. 25-28); his disbelief in Kyd's authorship of a scene in the play (dealt with in a number of scattered passages); and his scepticism as to Heywood's having a hand in *Sir Thomas Moore* (pp. 34-39). Dr. Tannenbaum points out (pp. 24-25, 28) oversights of Dr. Sisson in his *Modern Language Review* (April, 1928) criticism of the former's books. Professor Baldwin's arguments against Kyd's participation in the play are opposed (pp. 30-33). Dr. Wilson's bibliographic arguments for the Shakespearian authorship of the Three Pages are taken up by Dr. Tannenbaum in some detail (pp. 44-59), and specific points are advanced in refutation. After replying to Dr. Wilson, Dr. Tannenbaum adduces various facts, calligraphic and bibliographic, with which he strengthens his case against the theory of Shakespearian part-authorship (pp. 54-60). In his final section (pp. 60-

61), Dr. Tannenbaum opposes Professor Schücking's suggestion that the Three Pages are possibly not in the hand of their author but in that of a copyist. Two "Postscripts" conclude the volume. In the first of them Dr. Tannenbaum summarizes certain of the points made in an earlier article (*PMLA.*, September, 1928): and in the second he casts some doubt upon the utility of a reference in *Sir Thomas Moore* to the scouring of Moorditch in aiding to fix its date of composition. In section 19 (pp. 39-44), Dr. Tannenbaum turns aside from *Sir Thomas Moore* and its authors to defend against Dr. Greg and Professor Sisson his belief that a scene in the manuscript of *The Faithful Friends* is in the handwriting of Massinger.

At this time something of an impasse seems to have been reached in the controversy concerning Shakespeare's hand in *Sir Thomas Moore*. The principal controversialists yield only the scantest of inches and that but seldom. For example, Dr. Wilson in his article, "Thirteen Volumes of Shakespeare: a Retrospect" (*MLR.*, Oct., 1930) says (p. 411) that Sir Edward Maunde Thompson's arguments "together with the bibliographical clues . . . , convinced me that the Three Pages in *Sir Thomas Moore* were in Shakespeare's autograph, and nothing that has since appeared has in any way shaken that conviction." This is the expression of a deeply rooted opinion; Dr. Tannenbaum is as firmly convinced of the truth of the contrary view.

Students of Shakespeare would be glad to have the question of the authorship of *Sir Thomas Moore* settled. That they can see it finally decided upon the evidence to be drawn from materials now available is too much to hope; Dr. Tannenbaum's acuteness, his readiness, and his store of learning displayed through his articles and books have done much to make clear the inadequacy of the grounds for assigning the Three Pages to Shakespeare. The reviewer, who is not an expert in calligraphic matters but who hopes to have common sense enough to weigh evidence (see *Shakspeare* and "*Sir Thomas Moore*," p. 10), inclines toward accepting as the soundest statement of the situation at present Dr. Tannenbaum's own pronouncement in his "*The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*" (p. 63, n. 10):

. . . it is impossible to say definitely that Shakespeare could not have been the writer of the "Addition" in *Sir Thomas Moore*. All that can logically be said is that at present the evidence from the handwriting is overwhelmingly against the theory that folios 8a, 8b, and 9a of Moore are a Shakespeare holograph.

ROBERT S. FORSYTHE

The University of North Dakota

A Game at Chesse, by THOMAS MIDDLETON. Edited by R. C. BALD. Cambridge University Press, 1929. Pp. x + 173. 12s., 6d.

"It is no exaggeration to say that more is known about *A Game at Chesse* than about any other pre-Restoration play." The new editor of Middleton's excellent piece of political satire provides a pleasantly-written historical introduction (in which the identification of the characters is ably discussed), an account of the stage history of the play, with the documents relative to its suppression and other allusions printed in an appendix, and quotes several new sources for passages in the text from contemporary pamphlets. But perhaps our chief debt to Mr. Bald is for his demonstration, by means of the dedication page of the Malone MS. of the play, that part of the Bridgewater-Huntington MS. and all of the MS. in Trinity College, Cambridge, are in Middleton's own hand. The editor has also adequately performed the necessary bibliographical work in distinguishing the three printed editions; and, utilizing the discoveries of Mr. F. P. Wilson, has shown that the Lansdowne and Malone MSS. are transcribed by the poet-scribener Ralph Crane.

But here our debt of gratitude to the editor is cut prematurely short. Mr. Bald has—rightly—chosen to reprint the Trinity MS. *verbatim*, with the exception of two or three specified changes, such as the normalization of speech-headings and making each line begin with a capital letter. It would have been much wiser to have followed the principles of the Malone Society reprints; very little, it seems to me, has been gained by these concessions to ease in reading. "The punctuation is, in the main, left intact, though it is admittedly very careless," says the editor. In view of this ambiguous statement, it is impossible to test the editor's accuracy on this score; however, if consistency was aimed at, the omission of some 37 commas found in *T* cannot have been intentional.

I have checked through the text with rotographs of *T* and find the following misreadings: II, i, 162, I for Ile (in the textual note, "I'll" is recorded as a variant, but from *M* only; whereas all the texts—I have not seen quarto 1, quarto 2 however is a reprint of 1—have this reading). II, ii, 26, glut *for* glue; 149, first *for* fixt; 153, infected *for* infested (no note on the variants is given; Q2, *L*, *M*, have the latter, Q3, the former reading, omitted in *B*); 177, forenamde: aforenamde; 288, Discouerie: Discouerer. IV, i, 16, knowe: knewe (the note gives the variant "knewe" in *L*, whereas *B*, *L*, Q3 have it also; Q2 alone has "knowe"). IV, ii, 17, T'as: h'as (no note is given. *L*, Q3: "hath"; *B*, Q2: "has"; *M* omits). IV, iv, 66, *L* and Q2 have "deliverer," Q3, "Deliuier" (an error for "Deliuierer" ?), and *B*, "Deliuiererance," which Bald prints silently as "Deliuier-

ance;" the reading of *B*, however, may represent the original reading plus an alteration by the scribe. V, ii, 15, the: her. V, iii, 112, the: a; 125, Monasterie: Monasteries. In the above instances all of the texts agree against the reading of the editor.

Besides these there are some 82 departures from the spelling of *T* and its use of the apostrophe. The list is too long to give here and an example or two must suffice. Thus in Prologue 5 distinguish't for distinguisht (here a part of the long *s* has been misread as an apostrophe). III, i, 144, Countries: Cuntries. III, ii, 32, Munckeyes ordinarie: Monckeyes ordinarie. V, iii, 210, malapert: malepert. In fifteen cases, final *e* is omitted (e. g., I, i, 39, comly for comlye). Moreover in V, ii and iii, though the editor is giving a *verbatim* reprint of *T*, he quite arbitrarily introduces a number of Middleton's own variant spellings from the Bridge-water-Huntington MS., which contains these scenes in the dramatist's hand.

If Mr. Bald's list of variants appears to the average reader

Much like the Ladie in the lobsters head,

A great deale of Shell and Garbidge of all colours (II, ii, 6-7),

it will, I fear, prove the same to the textual critic. In view of the several texts of *A Game at Chesse*, a textual commentary that would classify and discuss the variants (such as Dr. Greg supplies for *Orlando Furioso* in his *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*) would be extremely valuable; as it is the reader is left, to quote the Black Knight, "to pick out Sillables . . . As children pick out Cherriestones." In lieu of this, the editor should have provided, at the least, an accurate and complete list of the variations of the other texts. As has already been indicated, the collations are far from complete; they are also occasionally incorrect or misleading. A notable example is the collation of the Malone MS. Mr. Bald says (p. 121), "*M* has no stage-directions except those mentioned in these notes," and yet omits to note 19 of them (e. g., II, i, 168, with the erroneous note "Exit: *found only in III*"). In regard to the admission of stage-directions into his text from other sources than *T*, the editor will not, I think, be found at all consistent. In IV, iv, though he supplies a necessary direction from *L*, he omits one equally necessary (l. 81, "Enter White King") which is found in all texts but the one he is here following.

According to the publishers' note on the jacket, "the MSS. of this play offer exceptional material for the study of the texts of Elizabethan dramas." It is therefore peculiarly unfortunate that, apart from its perfunctory text, the present edition should obscure so much of this material and thus defeat one of the chief reasons for a new edition.

BERNARD M. WAGNER

Cambridge, Massachusetts

The Elizabethan Fairies: The Fairies of Folklore and the Fairies of Shakespeare. By MINOR WHITE LATHAM. New York, Columbia University Press, 1930. Pp. viii + 313. \$3.75.

The literature of art is not the literature of the folk, and when one obtrudes upon the other a hybrid product invariably results which belies the true essence of each. Our present conception of fairies as "pleasant myths and fanciful heroines of childrens' stories" may be traced back to just such a cross-breeding. The fairies of England in Elizabeth's time and long before were the unique property of the folk, obscure in origin, but living, ever-present entities, an important part of that vast, popular lore which transforms giants, dragons, and ghosts into fearful realities. These genuine fairies of the folk belong to the category of wicked spirits. Their reputation was an evil one. They were of the size and general appearance of mortals and resided in the hills of the countryside. They tormented people, stole babies, consorted with witches, and were not above causing the death of unfortunates whom they disliked. If one were inclined to be sceptical of their acceptance among the people as real creatures, a mere perusal of the witchcraft trials of the Elizabethan period would set at rest all doubts. Obviously then, our own conception of the fairies as imaginary, infinitesimal beings who can curl up to sleep in a flower, as the Queen of the fairies in *Iolanthe*, is quite at variance with the beliefs of popular fairy lore. An explanation of this conflict provides the main thesis in *The Elizabethan Fairies*.

The author of this book, after a careful study of the pertinent outstanding literature of the 16th and 17th centuries, reaches the conclusion that the modern conception of fairies owes its origin to Shakespeare's imaginative treatment of them, especially in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. There is not the slightest reason to doubt the validity of this conclusion. From literary works preceding Shakespeare, and from contemporary treatises on demonology and witchcraft, the writer obtains an abundance of material for presenting a clear picture of the fairies and their world as they existed in the popular beliefs of the day. They were, as described above, wicked spirits, of the stature and general proportions of human beings, and very much feared by the folk. But the imagination of Shakespeare in a playful mood transformed them into beneficent spirits, infinitesimal in size, and valued by the folk for their helpfulness and their occasional presents of gold. And with this conception went the delightful, fanciful nature and airy movements which Shakespeare imparted to his fairies.

Shakespeare's contemporaries were not slow in succumbing to the ineffable charm of his creation, and with the passing of time the original folk conception of the fairies gave way before the more

attractive fairy world of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. It is interesting to observe, as the author points out, how the 17th and 18th centuries lost almost completely any proper understanding of the original fairy lore. We even find Dr. Johnson defining the fairy as, "A fabled being supposed to appear in a diminutive human form, and to dance in the meadows, and to reward cleanliness in houses." This, of course, is Shakespeare's fairy. In fact, it was not until Walter Scott made a study of the subject that the wicked fairy of purely popular origin was rediscovered.

The book has a threefold value since it concerns material important to the student of Shakespeare, of the Elizabethan period, and of folklore. The latter, however, comes off least happily, for the author wisely eschews delving into the complex question of the origin of the English fairy and of fairies in general. Although the author again employs pardonable discretion in limiting the material for the investigation of such a broad field, yet the general excellence of the work suffers a little from ruling out of consideration the popular ballad. Despite their "timelessness," much valid evidence could have been obtained from the ballads in support of the author's views on the fairies of popular lore. Successors in this field of investigation will be aided by an excellent bibliography of the works employed in the present study.

E. J. SIMMONS

Harvard University

Lewes Lavater: Of Ghosts and Spirites Walking by Nyght, 1572.

Edited with Introduction and Appendix by J. DOVER WILSON and MAY YARDLEY. Printed for the Shakespeare Association At the University Press, Oxford, 1929. \$6.00.

This treatise by Ludwig Lavater, the Swiss Protestant priest, is the most important document in the theological controversy which was carried on with vigor during the last half of the sixteenth century. The views expressed in it formed an important part of the intellectual milieu of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. This line-by-line reprint of R. H.'s English translation of the work in a volume of the Shakespeare Association, makes the document for the first time easily accessible to all students of Elizabethan thought. Equally indebted are they to Miss Yardley's skillful resumé of Pierre Le Loyer's *III Livres des spectres*, 1586, the authoritative Catholic reply to Lavater, which serves as an appendix to the volume.

Mr. Dover Wilson has written an introductory essay called "The Ghost-scenes in *Hamlet* in the Light of Elizabethan Spiritualism." Here he advances new views about the ghost in *Hamlet* so effectively that he almost persuades us to accept them, without rigorous

scrutiny. His thesis is that Shakespeare consciously made *Hamlet* an epitome of the ghost lore of his age. In so doing he appealed to an interest already active in the minds of almost all the members of his contemporary audiences. Consequently his play reflects not only current superstitions regarding ghosts, but also current philosophical and theological opinions about them. Of these there were three distinct views abroad in his world. The first was that expressed by Reginald Scot in the essay called "Discourse upon Devils and Spirits" at the end of his *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584). He believed that spirits existed, but was completely skeptical of their power to assume any material form. Apparitions, therefore, were either illusions of minds unsettled by melancholy or tricks of knaves. Horatio, when he first appears in the play, is a skeptic of this order. He is sure that the reported ghost is but a fantasy, an hallucination of the watchers.

The second view of the time, that of folk superstition and Catholic tradition, was that Ghosts were spirits allowed for special purposes of the Divinity to return from Purgatory. The ghost, in *Hamlet*, is in this respect a good Catholic and the only one in the play. For dramatic purposes, to be sure, Shakespeare is with him. He insists that we accept the ghost as a spirit.

The third view was that of the Protestants, most vigorously expressed in Lavater's work. By rejecting Purgatory the new theology of necessity abandoned the idea that ghosts were the spirits of dead men. They had gone directly either to Heaven or Hell, "from whose bourn No traveller returns." Between the Catholic and Protestant views *Hamlet* vacillates. He has no doubt about the objective reality of the apparition, but he has grave doubts whether it is his father's spirit returned from Purgatory. It may be, as Lavater suggests, a devil who has assumed the shape of a man lately departed. Indeed Mr. Wilson would have us believe that *Hamlet's* vacillation about the ghost was between the two orthodox opinions of Elizabethan thought. Therefore, he had much more excuse for this mental conflict than most of his modern critics realize. The first act, Mr. Wilson infers, thus "possesses something of the character of a Shaw discussion drama without the discussion."

All this is brilliantly argued by the author. Yet he fails to show that the characters represent as clearly as he believes the three contesting contemporary views about ghosts. Horatio's skepticism, for example, is expressed in so cursory a fashion as to leave no permanent impression on anyone in the audience. It disappears at his first view of the ghost. This swift abandonment of a skeptical attitude is one of the dramatic devices by which Shakespeare convinces his audience that, whatever *Hamlet* may think, it must not doubt the authenticity of the spirit. Nor does *Hamlet's* dilemma about the ghost assume for him the psychological importance that Mr. Wilson suggests. In the play he expresses now the one, now

the other, opinion; but he never devotes a soliloquy to balancing his mind between these two convictions. He never considers this particular question with his characteristic subtlety. He never makes a debate with himself on this subject his contribution to Mr. Wilson's drama of discussion. The truth is that, as the critic himself admits, Shakespeare has etched in the typical opinions about the ghost so economically that few members of even an Elizabethan audience would turn from other more obvious appeals to their interest, even to recognize a dramatic version of this favorite theological debate and to delight in it as such.

Mr. Wilson's essay accomplishes, nevertheless, a solid result. It establishes the importance of setting the ghost in *Hamlet* against the contemporary conflicting opinions of "spirites walking by nyght." Most persons in the first audiences who saw the play firmly believed in the reality of apparitions. They would differ only in their conception of the cause of these phenomena. Consequently Hamlet's problem about the authenticity of his father's spirit must have awakened among Elizabethan spectators a sympathetic curiosity, which we can best realize by reading this reprint of Lavater's work, in the light of Mr. Wilson's entertaining essay.

University of Michigan

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL

Thomas Killigrew: Cavalier Dramatist: 1621-38. By ALFRED HARBAGE. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930. Pp. ix + 247. \$3.00.

This is a useful and conscientious study of a minor but interesting Restoration dramatist, a book that wanted doing and has been well done by Mr. Harbage. Slightly more than half the volume is devoted to a careful tracing of Killigrew's life, and the remainder to his plays, classified as amateur, semi-professional, and closet drama. The author gives bibliographical and theatrical notes, summarizes plots, discusses sources, and indicates the special significance of Killigrew's pre-Commonwealth plays in the development of English drama—"paleo-heroic" plays, he calls them. The study is well documented and usually cautious. An exception is the implication that the stage directions of *Bellamira Her Dream* go to show that elaborate scenery was employed in the London theatres at an earlier date than is generally supposed. As Mr. Harbage himself points out, we have here a closet drama. There is no reason for believing that Killigrew did not visualize its non-existent stage-effects from what he had seen on the Continent or from English court masques. That he himself was not a writer of court masques is scarcely pertinent.

In the biographical portion Mr. Harbage is more concerned with Killigrew's private life than with his career as a theatrical magnate. He seems obsessed with the ethical bias against which Sir Sidney Lee warns in his recently reprinted essays on "The Principles of Biography." Mr. Harbage certainly throws Killigrew's life into a new perspective, but justly or not he gives the impression of being out to whitewash his subject. Most of his statements about Killigrew's morals are pretty general. Was he, for instance, or was he not, the Merry Monarch's pandar? On the other hand, a strong presumption is raised by Mr. Harbage that some of the escapades attributed to Tom actually belong to his graceless son, Henry, with whom later generations confused him. There is a real need for such studies as this of the secondary figures among the Restoration dramatists, and for the reprinting of their plays. It is to be hoped that Mr. Harbage will make some of Killigrew's texts more accessible than they now are.

HAZELTON SPENCER

Epsom Wells and *The Volunteers* or *The Stock-Jobbers*. By THOMAS SHADWELL. Edited by D. M. WALMSLEY. New York, D. C. Heath and Company [1930]. Pp. lxx + 387. \$1.

During the past dozen years there has been a renewed interest in the drama of the late seventeenth century. The complete works of several of the more important playwrights have been published, and numerous studies of individual writers have appeared. To these have now been added two of Shadwell's comedies ably edited by Dr. D. M. Walmsley in a volume which in every respect upholds the high standards set by the earlier publications in the Belles-Lettres series. Students of the drama should be grateful to Dr. Walmsley for making available in an inexpensive edition two plays which are not contained in the Mermaid volume of Shadwell's comedies.

The texts are carefully prepared; the notes are full and adequate. There is also a brief biography and an excellent introductory essay. In the latter Dr. Walmsley emphasizes "the remarkable versatility of Shadwell" and shows the important position he holds in the development of operatic drama in England, but the greater part of the essay naturally deals with Shadwell as a writer of realistic comedies. Although he was a ceaseless admirer of Ben, his plays are "by no means slavish imitations of Jonsonian models"; in his earliest work, *The Sullen Lovers*, there are passages which point forward to the Congrevian type of comedy of manners. This "combination of the humors type and of the manners type of comedy" is exhibited in *Epsom Wells*, whereas in *The Volunteers*

with these types is blended the sentimental, faintly visible in the character of the country-loving Eugenia. Dr. Walmsley is most enthusiastic in his praise of the latter play: "Inspired professedly on the comedy of Ben Jonson, Shadwell's work reveals a fresh vitality, his humors are invested with a greater human interest than his master's stiffly drawn figures usually possess, whilst his dialogue is more natural and spontaneous than either Jonson's or Congreve's." Although not all students of the British drama would be willing to subscribe to this opinion *in toto*, few would disagree with the statement that "in range of humors Shadwell was without rival in his time" or that his merits as a dramatist are to be found in the truthfulness of his descriptions and in his skillful characterizations.

The reviewer is not convinced by the evidence submitted that the Anne Gibbs who married Shadwell had been "previously the wife of Thomas Gaudy, of Claxton, Norfolk" (p. x; note also pp. xvii, 189). It is known that an Anne Gibbs, the daughter of "Thomas Gibbs, of Norwich, Gent.," married Gaudy at St. Clement Danes on July 12, 1662, and that Shadwell in his will refers to his "dearly beloved wife, Anne, the daughter of Tho. Gibbs, late of Norwich, deceased, proctor and public notary." It is possible that the same father and daughter are meant in both instances; but is it not also possible that a town the size of Norwich had two citizens by the name of Thomas Gibbs, each of whom had a daughter Anne? Is a mere similarity in names and town of residence sufficient evidence upon which to base the assertion that Mrs. Anne Shadwell had at one time been married to Thomas Gaudy? There are a few slips in proof reading: p. vii, l. 12, for "1636" read "1639"; p. xlv, l. 8, for "1673" read "1672"; p. xlv, l. 9, for "1680" read "1681." On p. xxiii, it is said that "only one revival of *Psyche* is recorded"—on April 8, 1697. The *Impartial Protestant Mercury*, No. 79, mentions a performance of this opera on January 19, 1682, and Genest lists a presentation at Drury Lane on June 10, 1704. It is to be hoped that this edition may indicate a revival of the Drama Section of the Belles-Lettres series, and that much needed texts of plays by Lee, Southerne, and Cibber are to follow.

New York University

ALBERT S. BORGMAN

Restoration Tragedy, 1660-1720. By BONAMY DOBRÉE. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1929. Pp. 189. \$3.00.

Professor Dobrée has followed his notable study of Restoration comedy by a companion volume on Restoration tragedy, written in the same lively and incisive style as the earlier work. His new book pretends to deal only with certain critical and literary aspects

of the subject and is in no sense a careful historical summary of the dramatic writing of the period. It is in form a series of related essays built around a threefold object: first, to define the outstanding quality in Restoration tragedy, its "heroic" tone, and to explain the birth of that tone; second, to consider the individual characteristics assumed by this "heroic" tragedy in the hands of the writers most influential in its development, Dryden, Lee, and Otway, and of those most indicative of its decline, namely Rowe, Congreve, and Addison (for to Professor Dobrée the failure of *Cato* marks the final submergence of the "heroic" emphasis under a new wave of literary fashion and critical feeling); third, to draw from a study of the strength and weakness in Restoration tragedy some conclusions regarding the necessary elements to be possessed by such tragedy as should be written in the present age.

This last objective has naturally resulted in an exposition of the author's credo concerning the fundamentals in the high art of tragedy, and their proportionate values. It is however an exposition which is scattered throughout the volume, and in a large measure must be pieced together by the reader. Yet such a method of presentation is not at all disturbing, for it continually gives Professor Dobrée the opportunity to proceed entertainingly and effectively from the actual illustration of a point of dramatic art as contained in a particular Restoration tragedy to a discussion of the literary ideal involved. Thus his book as a whole becomes a stimulating inquiry into tragedy in general, which he defines as "the realm where man explores his daring against the overwhelming odds of life, and tests the depth of his acceptance."

Of course the inquiry is patently colored by several strong opinions of the critic. Professor Dobrée finds the present a sterile age for tragedy. He believes there is now "notoriously lacking a common metaphysic, or general impulse" upon which tragedy, to reach a successful issue, must be based. The advance of democracy has made "increasingly unpopular, indeed incomprehensible" the tragic portrayal of life, which is essentially concerned with man's trial of his individual strength against the inevitable forces of existence. Moreover, Professor Dobrée holds that in tragic drama "character is only the secondary symbol, meant to give life to the poet's main symbol, which is plot." Restoration tragedy, he points out, gave the foremost place to plot. Its form and structure are in consequence admirable, though the choice of human emotional material laid upon the form is faulty. Modern tragedy, on the other hand, suffers greatly from too much literalness in its rendition of human experience and is not literary enough. Perhaps it is due especially to the two currents of opinion just outlined that Professor Dobrée sets forth a critical estimate of Restoration tragedy somewhat more favorable than might be expected. He appears to go rather far when he says one or two tragic plays of

this period are "superbly successful" with here and there "some adequate ones." He becomes even more extreme at the close of his survey by concluding that Restoration tragedy "does occupy a high place, higher than that to be claimed by any drama that has succeeded it, with the exception of Ibsen's and Strindberg's." It is hard to understand how Professor Dobrée can make such a claim in the face of his own penetrating analysis of the tragedy of the age in question, in which he finds "the structure of tragedy was threatened at its base, since love was the main element relied upon to produce pity." In the same vein also he summarizes the whole tragic drama of the time as "an art of escape, not of profound realization."

Yet it is curious that this blatant note of artificiality, which at times Professor Dobrée fully recognizes, does not seem to reach his ears continuously. For example, his comment on Dryden betrays a strange contradiction. He stresses at first the labored prettiness and sheer artifice of Dryden's plays, the fact that Dryden is scarcely concerned with the great statement of tragedy—"This is what happens to man"—and then he later sums up Dryden's attitude toward literary art by the remark that "for him, as for Hardy the thing made was to be a presentation of life." Is that not an absurd comparison and conclusion? Only an extraordinary use of phraseology could possibly explain away the glaring illogic of Professor Dobrée's critique at this point. Thus throughout the book Professor Dobrée wavers between a complete awareness of the hollowness in the Restoration age and its writers, and apparent periods of obliviousness to their true spiritual state, when he treats with utter seriousness their pronouncements and creations as if they proceeded from an honest heart. Where there is no real sincerity of the artistic spirit in the writing of tragedy, as confessedly there was not in the Restoration period, it is difficult to comprehend how Professor Dobrée can pass over at times this great flaw of soul so lightly. It is in such moments that he deems modern tragedy mean in comparison to its perhaps more shapely, but surely far less genuine predecessor of two centuries ago. The seeming inconsistency of Professor Dobrée's critical attitude constitutes for this reviewer the one important weakness of the book. Nevertheless his study is to be highly enjoyed and valued by all interested in Restoration literature, in English drama, or even in the general subject of Tragedy.

WILLIAM S. CLARK

Amherst College

Cross Currents in English Literature of the XVIIth Century. The Messenger Lectures on the Evolution of Civilization, Cornell University, 1926-7. By H. J. C. GRIERSON. London, Chatto and Windus, 1929.

At a moment of schism and strife, when the word is tearing its disciples asunder, it is pleasant to come upon a critic who writes *humanely* of Humanism! It is doubly pleasant to find that critic conscious of both the positive and the negative aspects of his use of the word, so that he is careful to define it in terms not only of its synonyms, but of its antonyms. It is finally complete refreshment to the jaded spirit to discover this critic of Humanism considering the movement as a *student*, rather than as a teacher, preacher, or disciple. Mr. Grierson's approach to his problem is historical; he has no party to uphold, no antagonist to condemn. The reader, weary of propaganda and argument, may approach this volume with relief and anticipation, and may let himself be carried along by sheer pleasure in the author's deft manipulation of his theme.

It is inevitable that even Mr. Grierson's treatment of so complex a subject as "the conflict between the spirit or temper of the Renaissance and of the Reformation" should be uneven. He has declared frankly in his preface that he is not a philosopher or theologian; and though his admirers may insist that in the past he has shown himself a better theologian and philosopher than many who claim the titles, yet it is true that as we turn from the luminous comments upon the poets to Mr. Grierson's discussion of the churchmen and philosophers, we feel that we turn from men among whom the author has lived to men about whom he has read. The most serious limitation of the volume is Mr. Grierson's almost complete neglect of the part played in the seventeenth-century mind and the seventeenth-century imagination by the developing scientific movement with all its implications. It is not enough to say that the subject does not make part of his plan; he himself is aware that it should do so. (Cf. pp. 299-300). Unfortunately, in his far too brief treatment of the matter, he seems to follow the traditional notion that the new scientific spirit was something that about 1660 sprang full-grown from the brain of Zeus—or of Satan! We must continue to regret the loss of a fuller and deeper consideration of the whole scientific question.

One misses, too, in his treatment of contemporary theology the richness of interpretation so apparent elsewhere. Although he pays lip-service to the Cambridge Platonists and estimates more or less accurately their service to that confused generation of which they were a part, his treatment of them lacks the depth of understanding of much that he has written, though his fine tribute to Ralph Cud-

worth's great *Sermon* (pp. 225-30) serves to offset his curious inclusion among the Cambridge Platonists of Joseph Beaumont (p. 280), who was actually one of the bitterest enemies More and Cudworth ever knew.

But if these are limitations of Mr. Grierson's treatment, certainly they are amply compensated by virtues common to all Mr. Grierson's work, which make this volume in many ways the best single treatment of seventeenth-century literature we possess. He brings to his interpretation of most of the writers acute perception, sane judgment, richness and fulness of understanding, most of all, ripe and leisurely wisdom. As might be expected, it is in his treatment of Donne and of Milton as poets that he excels. His Donne is the real man of the century, a mature man of "passionate feeling and curiously analytical mind," not the tortured adolescent which the Romantics made in their own image, and which the neo-Romanticists are daily developing. So too his Milton emerges a more complete individual than the nineteenth-century critics believed, a less provocative figure than many contemporary psychological writers suggest. Mr. Grierson holds the balance admirably between an interpretation of Milton which would dismiss too easily the autobiographical elements in his work, and one which would over-sentimentalize the work in order to detect the man. His Milton is an artist who, in contrast to Donne, remains somehow aloof and apart through his own fastidiousness, as notable in his life as in his art, solitary, thoughtful, scholarly, an onlooker at life—in the fine phrase which his contemporary John Norris used of the "Angel of Christ's" forever the "Intellectual Epicure."

Yet both Donne and Milton emerge as humanists in the sense in which Mr. Grierson has used that term, humanists in their sharing in that point of view (p. 18) "which the revival of learning was bringing back, a fairer estimate of man's nature, his natural capacities and virtues, the legitimate instinct of enjoyment." Diverse as they are, they are brought together into the stream of humanism, illustrating in their different ways Mr. Grierson's sane and competent definition (p. 18):

Humanism was an acceptance of human life and values as right and reasonable and, if controlled by a sense of measure, needing not in themselves to be repented of, a revival of values and ideals on which the best thought of antiquity had set the seal of its approval; and among these values is pleasure, the enjoyment of life and its good things, and chief among them the arts—the great decorators of man's life, the fullest and finest expression of his sense of the joy of life, the beauty inherent in all that is.

MARJORIE NICOLSON

Smith College

BRIEF MENTION

Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. ix. 1928. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by E. SEATON and M. S. SERJEANTSON. Cambridge, Bowes & Bowes, 1929. Pp. 228. 6 s. 6 d. The ninth issue of this valuable bibliography is the work of Miss Everett and Miss Serjeantson. The retirement of the former, which is announced in the preface, will be regretted by all who know how faithfully she has assisted in the undertaking since its conception. Miss Serjeantson, who is well known for her studies in the Middle English dialects, will assume full responsibility for next year and the Association is to be congratulated on securing so competent an editor to carry on its fine work.

The most important innovation in the present number is the omission of the date from items where the date is that of the current year, and its insertion at the head of the page. A small saving of space and effort is thus effected, but the system provides no way of indicating whether a book bears the date of publication on its title page or is without date. A minor change in the arrangement of the sections on "Word Study" and "Name Study" will considerably facilitate reference. Each of these sections now consists of a sub-section headed *Miscellaneous* and a sub-section in which the words and names are arranged alphabetically. Not the least of the merits of the bibliography is the adequacy with which the work of foreign countries is covered. Such an achievement is possible only through the coöperation of a number of contributors in Europe and America. Professor Broughton's contribution alone, as the editors generously acknowledge, regularly amounts to one-half of the whole material.

At the risk of seeming ungracious, the writer cannot refrain from again voicing the wish that the publishers will continue their experiments in an effort to find a cover that will not curl when exposed to the air.

ALBERT C. BAUGH

Heath Manual of the Literature of England Based upon the Text of Heath Readings in the Literature of England. By IRVING GARWOOD. Boston: Heath, 1930. Pp. x + 256. Except for a few pages of general "topics for review or research" this volume consists entirely of questions on selections such as are often read in sophomore survey courses in English literature. There are many "recognition passages" to be identified. Questions like the more searching and suggestive of these and like those on Shakespeare

prepared by Professor Odell Shepard, should stimulate teachers and keep them from slipping into ruts.

R. D. H.

Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola On the Imagination; the Latin Text, with an Introduction, an English Translation, and Notes. By HARRY CAPLAN. Cornell Studies in English, vol. XVI, 1930. 114 pp. \$1.00. Students of psychology and ethics will be grateful for this modern edition of the younger Pico's treatise *On the Imagination*, revised and translated by a competent scholar. The Latin is not easy, and the precise meaning is not always clear. The notes are scholarly and sound. They show that Pico's main source is Aristotle's *De Anima*, but that he draws also from Plato and the Neoplatonists, and from Christian theology.

W. P. MUSTARD

Wilhelm Meister and his English Kinsmen. By SUSANNE HOWE. New York, Columbia University Press, 1930. Pp. 331. \$3.00. This book traces the establishment by Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* of a type of novel which has since had a continuous and vigorous life in English literature. *Wilhelm Meister* is primarily a story of self-culture by experience, which differentiates itself from Rousseau's *Emile* and other education novels by the emphasis it places upon organic development according to inner capacity as opposed to a training directed from without. Miss Howe studies briefly the origins of Goethe's novel in the eighteenth century cults of the genius and the virtuoso, and in the educational theorizing of the time. She then devotes a chapter to *Wilhelm Meister* itself.

Her chief subject, however, is the influence of the great novel in England, at first only upon critics and romantic poets, but soon upon fiction. Beginning with Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* and several of Bulwer's novels, this influence developed a type of novel which soon ceased to recognize its own ancestry. Disraeli, Sterling, Lewes, Froude, Geraldine Jewsbury, Kingsley, Mrs. Humphrey Ward, Samuel Butler, Meredith, Bennett, Beresford, Walpole, Mackenzie, Maugham, and Wells are the chief novelists who have carried on the tradition, with many variations which Miss Howe traces.

The most interesting part of the book is its successful attempt to define the origins and characteristics of the self-culture novel. This material contributes both general ideas and valuable technical distinctions in the theory of prose fiction. The treatment of English novels influenced by *Meister* suffers by comparison with the earlier part of the book, largely because the objects of study have less intrinsic interest. Miss Howe's criticism is sympathetic and intelligent throughout, and it is based upon wide reading.

University of Nebraska

THOMAS M. RAYSOR

The French Literature of Louisiana. By RUBY VAN ALLEN CAULFEILD. New York: Institute of French Studies, Columbia University, 1929. Pp. xv + 282. Miss Caulfeild's monograph is little more than a *catalogue raisonné* of the subject, and, like so many other studies of provincial literature, suffers from a lack of critical perspective. Aside from the unexpected extent of French literature in Louisiana, the most interesting aspect of the subject is that this literature is overwhelmingly romantic. Miss Caulfeild, however, does not go into the question of sources and influence to any degree. There is a useful bibliography.

University of Michigan

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

Chief Contemporary Dramatists: Third Series: Twenty Plays from the Recent Drama of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Spain, Russia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the Yiddish Theatre, and Scandinavia. Selected and edited by THOMAS H. DICKINSON. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1930. Pp. ix + 698. \$3.75. The third volume of this excellent series gives plays by O'Neill, Green, Howard, Milne, O'Casey, Wedekind, Kaiser, Hofmannsthal, Vildrac, Lenormand, Pirandello, Benelli, the Álvarez Quinteros, the Martínez Sierras, Andreyev, Yevreinov, Molnar, Čapek, Ansky, Sigurjónsson. An appendix supplies a working book list for the whole field, a reading list by countries, brief notes on the original productions of the plays, a short biographical sketch and list of plays for each author, and an index of characters. In an incisive introduction Professor Dickinson reviews the state of the drama at the time each of his anthologies appeared, that is, in 1915, 1921, and 1930. In the first volume the British Isles were represented by eight plays, in the second by five, in the third by one. The conclusion is plain, and must be painful to all who speak the English tongue. Frank Vernon was right in holding (in *The Twentieth Century Theatre*) that the War ended the second great renaissance of British drama. When Shaw leaves the stage, even the epilogue will be over. On the other hand, not the number but the quality of the American plays in the third volume is impressive. They are *The Emperor Jones*, *In Abraham's Bosom*, and *The Silver Cord*. When one reflects that the second volume offered nothing better than *The Easiest Way*, *The Piper*, and *The Yellow Jacket*, and that when the first appeared the best American drama could muster was the fantastic *Scarecrow* of Mackaye and the sorry stuff of Fitch, Moody, and Augustus Thomas, one perceives that, if drama was the last department of American literature to grow up, its rise in the last decade has been rapid and encouraging.

H. S.

Dryden and Howard: 1664-1668: the Text of An Essay of Dramatic Poesy, The Indian Emperor, and The Duke of Lerma: With Other Controversial Matter. Edited by D. D. ARUNDELL. Cambridge University Press, 1929. Pp. xiv + 288. \$3.50. The editor states that he has taken his texts from the first editions; but he corrects silently, and on pp. 129-133 I find seven variations from Q 1667 of *The Indian Emperor*. Thus, for Mr. Arundell's "seasons in a timely birth" (p. 131), the editions of 1667, 1668, 1681, 1686, 1692, 1694, 1696, 1701, 1703, 1709, and 1732 all have *season*. Mr. Arundell's reading agrees with the Scott-Saintsbury edition, but with only the third (Q 167c) of the earlier editions. I need not give further citations, for though it bears a distinguished imprint, this book is not a scholarly performance. "To collect the whole of the controversy on *Dramatic Poesy*, and to give in the same cover a practical example of each of the protagonists' theories—that is my aim." It is useful to have these materials brought together; but the editor's introduction is negligible, he gives no notes, and apparently his text can not be relied upon, even allowing for its modernized form. The repunctuation is sometimes very odd; for, "to avoid the impression of regular metre [in *The Indian Emperor*], which with rhyme becomes manifestly sing-song," the editor sprinkles his text with dots (. . .), in "hope that these pauses may help the reader to realize the emotions of the characters more easily. Yet I have not invented these pauses out of my head. They are all represented (intentionally or not) by commas, colons and semi-colons in the original." Why the editor supposes that replacing three varieties of stops by one will conduce to sharing the characters' emotions he does not explain.

H. S.

Brawny Wycherley: First Master in English Modern Comedy. By WILLARD CONNELLY. New York, Scribner's, 1930. Pp. xii + 352. \$3.00. Despite some parade of original research, this is a popular biography, not a contribution. The author is content to take most of his facts (and sometimes his phraseology) from secondary sources, which he cites without much discrimination; and he embroiders pretty freely. Many of his statements about the theatres, for example, betray his lack of exact information. The merit of the book lies, not in any notable penetration of Wycherley's character or grasp of his significance, but in a lively style and the vividness with which the Restoration and later scenes are imagined.

H. S.

of
a:
L.
ne
s;
a-
n-
7,
32
t-
er
a
e.
d
o-
re
is
e
c-
of
-
ts
e
d
-
,"
s
s

.
-
a
o
n
;
t
.
f
y
s